

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of July 2), 1954, and omitted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POSTMASTER

Thomas W. Robison to be postmaster at Lecompte, La.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast entrusted our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress with a high vocation, grant that they may take great pride in their loyalty and devotion to the welfare of our country.

May every citizen earnestly seek to add splendor and nobility to the life of our Republic by cultivating those lofty spiritual virtues which were the secret of the strength and greatness of the Founding Fathers.

Show us how we may be the worthy partners of all who are striving to build a social order that has in it the spirit of brotherhood and good will, of justice and righteousness, of kindness and charity.

Inspire us to do Thy will and help us to hasten the coming of the time when every human need shall be supplied and there shall be peace on earth.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate in the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

### TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which makes the following provision:

That the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the procedures and practices under the Trading With the Enemy Act during the period from December 18, 1941, to the present day.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am doing this is that two bills have been introduced. They are identical. One was reported out of the Senate committee,

S. 3324. The other bill was introduced by me in the House, H. R. 9985. These bills would restore enemy property that was confiscated under the law passed in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely contrary to any jurisprudence or any law that this country has ever acted under that we should confiscate enemy property. It is also contrary to English law, and that dates almost back to Magna Carta. The confiscation of alien property started in 1945. This policy was engineered and finally gotten through the Congress, through the offices of Harry Dexter White, who has since been, and is now acknowledged, to have been a true Communist. He was also one of the principal authors of the Morgenthau plan. Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman refused to give their sanction to this policy, and it was only gotten through the Congress by tying it up to the War Claims Commission, in other words, giving it a sentimental slant by saying that this money would take care of injured war prisoners.

Since the end of World War II this Government has poured millions of dollars into the rehabilitation of both Germany and Japan in order that they may be strong allies and bulwarks against communism. At the same time we have been withholding privately owned property from individual citizens of these countries. We have been giving with one hand and taking away with the other, and have alienated people whom we are trying to make our friends.

If the Congress is sympathetic to this legislation, it will be most helpful to the Adenauer government in Germany, who are friendly to our cause in Europe. The enemies of the regime are now saying: "What has friendship for the United States done for Germany? We are still disunited, we have not obtained EDC, and our property remains confiscated. It would be far better to restore these properties rather than pour your billions into Germany and Japan, which is humiliating and makes only for ill feeling and enmity."

### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY SUPPLIES AND RESOURCES POLICY

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, the President announced the formation of a Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

The White House announcement stated that the Committee would be composed of the heads of the Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of Justice, Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, and the Office of Defense Mobilization. Its chairman will be Mr. Arthur Flemming, who heads the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Committee is to submit its recommendations to

President Eisenhower not later than December 1.

The Committee's scope of study embraces areas of vital importance to our national well-being.

This is demonstrated by the following excerpt from the announcement:

At the direction of the President the Committee will undertake a study to evaluate all factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources and fuels in the United States, with the aim of strengthening the national defense, providing orderly industrial growth, and assuring supplies for our expanding national economy and for any future emergency.

This is a task worthy of the Committee's obvious stature. To help perform it, Mr. Flemming is empowered to appoint, as members of a special task force, from outside the Government, experts in each one of the areas to be studied.

Industries specifically mentioned for review are oil, natural gas, and coal.

Previous efforts at studies of this sort have been somewhat disappointing. It is my feeling that this was largely due to the fact that sufficient attention was not given, at the outset, to the selection of people possessing sufficient practical, experienced knowledge in the field they were studying. I am sure that will not be the case in the selection of the aforementioned task force. The White House announcement clearly indicates a heartfelt desire to conduct a fundamental study, without preconceived philosophies as to the ultimate result.

As my colleagues in the House know, I have often addressed myself in the past to a number of problems which appear to fall within the direct purview of this Cabinet Committee. For example, the formation of such a committee recognizes the growing need for a solution to such problems as that presented by excessive oil imports.

I addressed myself to this problem at length in the House on June 23, as well as on other occasions.

On June 23 I delineated the conditions which make for a dangerous oversupply of oil. In so doing I discussed the role of excessive imports in this oversupply picture.

The seriousness of the situation is unchanged today. Oil inventories stand at a level of 40 million barrels in excess of those of a year ago. Allowed production of oil has been repeatedly reduced in a number of States to attempt to alleviate a situation which poses a serious threat to the industry's economic stability. Yet oil imports in 1954, as indicated by contemplated programs, will exceed those of 1953. This will continue a trend which has been going on throughout the post-war period, when imports have risen from about 377,000 barrels daily in 1946 to over 1,050,000 barrels per day at the present time.

Foreign oil cannot continue to enter the country in such volume without seriously impairing the industry's capacity to produce oil for emergency needs. The industry must be healthy in time of peace in order to be ready in time of war.

The new Cabinet Committee's scope of review will certainly embrace the oil imports problem, which is so closely related

to the defense considerations stressed in the White House announcement.

The formation of such a committee is a tribute to this administration's wisdom in dealing with problems vital to our national defense.

The Congress, too, must survey this problem. It is sufficiently complex and important to utilize the thinking of the best men in all areas and levels of government.

The outcome of such thinking may well provide the answer to a question vital to our very security, "Shall we produce our own fuels or be reliant on areas which we may not be able to hold in time of war?"

It is a question which must soon be answered.

#### STORAGE CAPACITY FOR GRAIN

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, while the Department of Agriculture is generally looked upon as the agency of the Federal Government which specializes in assisting farmers, the present administration is also giving agriculture practical assistance through other governmental departments and agencies.

The Small Business Administration, for example, through its financial assistance to business firms is helping to meet the needs of farmers in many ways.

New storage capacity for 9,444,360 bushels of grain will result from small business loans approved by the Small Business Administration during the past 6 months.

All of this new storage capacity will be available to help take care of the 1955 crop. Most of the construction resulting from these loans will be expansion of present facilities in areas where the need for grain storage exceeds present capacity.

Following are the Small Business Administration loans approved to date for construction of added grain storage facilities by State totals:

Arizona, \$135,000; Arkansas, \$65,000; Colorado, \$80,000; Idaho, \$108,000; Kansas, \$836,000; Michigan, \$90,000; Mississippi, \$150,000; Missouri, \$150,000; Nebraska, \$409,500; New York, \$150,000; Oklahoma, \$613,000; Texas, \$843,000; Washington, \$150,000.

One-fourth of all the loans approved by the Small Business Administration to help small-business enterprises are going to small firms in rural areas engaged in business activity closely related to and of benefit to the farming community.

Small Business Administrator Wendell B. Barnes said in commenting on his agency's lending activities.

Of the 553 small-business loans, totaling \$32,320,562, tentatively approved by the Small Business Administration through July 20, 139 loans, totaling \$7,240,000, are in rural areas, he pointed out.

In addition to grain storage elevators, these firms include livestock and poultry feed mills, alfalfa-processing plants, bean storage and processing plants, food canners, proprietors of frozen-food locker plants, poultry processors and meat packers, dairies, farm-machinery dealers and manufacturers of specialized farm equipment, seed dealers, chicken hatcheries, fertilizer dealers, fruit packers, and distributors of propane gas.

The small-business financial-assistance program—

Mr. Barnes said—

embraces small firms in all sections of the country. While much of our activity is in the large industrial centers, we are also doing an effective job in the rural areas, where small firms are enlarging their activities and improving their services to farmers.

Many of our loans are made with the cooperation of rural banks and they are helping provide new jobs as well as aiding in the development of our basic agricultural resources.

As examples of small-business assistance loans made to small firms in rural areas, Mr. Barnes cited the following:

A 7-year loan was made to a small tomato cannery in Indiana. The proprietor, who employs up to 100 persons in the peak canning season, was having difficulty in accumulating sufficient working capital to permit the most efficient operation of his plant. The local bank was providing short-term loans to help finance the canning pack, but could not make a term loan. A Small Business Administration loan of \$28,700 provided modern equipment enabling the plant to operate more efficiently.

A proprietor of a small dairy in New England, employing seven persons, lost his barn, dairy, equipment, and home in a fire and required a term loan to pay his contractors and suppliers. A Small Business Administration 7-year loan of \$35,000 permitted him to rebuild his business.

A businessman in a small Texas community saw an opportunity to develop a new business, pressure-cresoting fence posts and poles. He plans to hire 8 to 10 persons when his plant is in operation. In addition to meeting the farm demand for fence posts, he had industrial customers, and a 5-year bank-participation loan for \$30,000 was arranged.

A 6-year bank-participation loan for \$25,000 was approved to help a small firm in Wisconsin. The firm manufactures farm mowers which can be attached to tractors. At peak operations in the fall and winter months, the firm employs 50 persons in the community.

A processor of citrus fruits in California was granted a 5-year loan of \$80,000 for working capital, with a local bank participating in the loan on a deferred basis. The firm has 27 employees and manufactures fruit concentrates and extracts.

A processor of dairy products in Kentucky with 52 employees was granted a 6-year loan of \$60,000, with a local bank participating. A part of the loan will be used for working capital, and part for adding new equipment. Additional dairy-product processing facilities are needed in the area since many farmers

are converting from beef-cattle raising to dairy herds.

A flour and feed mill in Oklahoma received a 5-year loan of \$71,000, with local bank participation. Proceeds of the loan will be used to construct additional storage space for feed grain and seed.

An industrial foundation in Arkansas, comprised of some 150 local businessmen, was granted a loan of \$166,666.66 to construct a poultry-processing plant in an area where new industry and additional employment were badly needed. A local bank participated in the loan. The increased equipment of this plant will provide an outlet for poultry and increase farm income in a large surrounding agricultural area in two States.

A processor of feed and seed peas in Idaho, employing from 4 to 20 persons, received a loan of \$200,000, with a local bank taking 25 percent of the loan on a deferred participation basis. Proceeds of the loan to be used to purchase seed peas from contract growers, and for processing the crop.

A loan of \$30,000 was made to a poultry processor in Minnesota to build new facilities. The loan, for 10 years was made in participation with a local bank. As a result of expanding its operations, the firm expects to be able to employ 10 additional persons.

A small firm in Oregon, which specializes in constructing and modernizing farm buildings, was granted a 5-year loan of \$7,000 to be used in expanding operations. The firm now has 10 employees, and the loan was made in participation with a local bank.

A retailer of seeds, farm supplies, and machinery in Virginia received a 3-year bank participation loan of \$22,000. Proceeds of the loan are to be used for working capital and consolidating obligations. The firm, which is located in a drought area, has 7 employees, and has been in business since 1866.

An Illinois processor of poultry and eggs received a 10-year deferred participation loan of \$98,000 to be used for working capital and to purchase additional equipment. The firm, which now employs an average of 103 persons, expects to be able to hire several more when its anticipated expansion is completed.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

#### CONFISCATION OF ALIEN PROPERTY

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply interested in the remarks just made by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] with reference to the question of private enemy property confiscated in the course of war. It used to



be an established principle of international law, or at least it was so considered when I went to law school, that enemy property was simply sequestered for the duration of hostilities and returned to the proper owners when the war was over. That principle should, I think, be adhered to, and I think it most regrettable that there should ever have been any substantial body of opinion to the contrary. I regret to say that I think the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be somewhat at fault for departing from the principle because we did, shortly after the end of World War II, report some legislation which earmarked, for the payment of certain claims, the Alien Property Fund. That, I think, was entirely wrong. If the claims were good claims, they should have been paid out of the Treasury. If they were not good claims, they should never have been paid at all, even if we had endless enemy property kicking around. This is only another illustration of the ease with which a government succumbs to the temptation of raiding a fund which should be preserved for its owners. The alien enemies were not criminals. The only theory on which their property was seized in the first place was to prevent its being used to aid the enemy in the prosecution of the war. Let us bear in mind that precedents which we now establish may some day be cited against us.

#### FOREIGN AID

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday night in which to file a report on the bill H. R. 9678.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys], dealing with a legislative matter in which all Members are entitled to know what is going on, use the microphone to make his request so that he can be heard.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman renew his request?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday night in which to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9678.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa would like to reserve a point of order against the conference report on the bill H. R. 9678. Is this the proper time?

The SPEAKER. No. That would be in order when the conference report is called up for consideration.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### INVESTIGATION OF PRACTICES IN RETAIL DISTRIBUTION OF FLUID MILK

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1954, I introduced House Joint Resolution 554 and explained the resolution to the House on the same day. My remarks will be found on pages 9204 and 9205 of the RECORD for July 2. This resolution was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 2. That was over a month ago. As of today, no hearings have been scheduled or held on the resolution. The resolution, as you will note, is short and to the point. This is a matter which the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin, whom I represent, and many other rural areas are interested in. The resolution directs the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of certain practices in the retail distribution of fluid milk to determine whether such practices are a restraint of trade and in violation of certain Federal laws.

Long and extended hearings are not necessary as the investigation asked for will be carried out by the Federal Trade Commission. It will not be necessary for the congressional committee to also investigate the practices at this time. There are many areas in the Nation where fluid milk can be produced at less cost per quart than in some of the areas now serving large metropolitan areas. The city consumer will receive the direct benefit in lower cost of production if such milk were not being kept out of the market.

I have written a letter today to the various members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce asking that action be had on this resolution so that the investigation can be started and a report completed before the next session of Congress. This report is necessary so legislation can be introduced to correct the same. I believe that the city consumers are just as much interested in this matter as the producers of milk who are now being shut out by present practices. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state at this time that if the Congress fails to act on this matter during this session I expect to introduce the same resolution in the next session and shall make an early effort to have it acted upon and passed so that the farmers and city consumers of the Nation will know the facts. I herewith submit a copy of my letter to the members of the committee and a copy of my resolution and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
WASHINGTON, D. C., August 5, 1954.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On July 2, I introduced House Joint Resolution 554 which had been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my hope that the resolution will be passed in this session of Congress so that the Federal Trade Commission can make an investigation and report

its findings and information to the next Congress.

My personal opinion is that since the Federal Trade Commission will be making the investigation, it will not be necessary for the committee to hold long and extended hearings on the resolution.

I will appreciate it very much if the resolution is reported out by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for action before the present session of Congress adjourns.

Your help in this, as a member of the committee, will be greatly appreciated. I am enclosing a copy of House Joint Resolution 554.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

#### House Joint Resolution 554

Joint resolution to provide for a study and investigation of certain practices in the retail distribution of fluid milk to determine whether such practices are in restraint of trade or otherwise in violation of certain other laws of the United States

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission is authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation of all phases of the retail distribution of milk, to determine whether any action, conduct, or other practice in such retail distribution which results in the exclusion from the markets of a particular area of fluid milk produced outside of such area, is in restraint of trade, an unfair method of competition in commerce, an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce, or otherwise violates the antitrust laws.

#### IMMUNITY FOR SUBVERSIVES

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to predict that if the bill that was passed by this House yesterday under suspension of the rules, giving the Congress the right to grant immunity to witnesses becomes law, we will be faced with one of the greatest scandals the country ever has had. Instead of that bill catching and convicting subversives, it will be the means of giving immunity to subversives who otherwise might be indicted and convicted and sent to prison. Happily, the bill must go to conference, and I trust that when it comes back if it does, that this House will give it more careful consideration than it received yesterday, and that we then get a better bill than was passed yesterday.

#### REVISION OF WAGE-HOUR LAW

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have been greatly concerned with the needed and necessary revisions of our present wage and hour law. In accordance with my view on this subject

and my experience, I am introducing today amendments to the wage-hour law.

The bill I have introduced today for the revision and improvement of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 would do the following:

Increase the present statutory minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to \$1.25 per hour.

Add roughly 9 million additional workers to the number now covered by the FLSA.

There are about 24 million covered as of today. Under my proposed bill this figure would become 34 million—still less than half of the number of all gainfully employed persons.

This bill would wipe out many of the unjustified exemptions both in the original 1938 act and in the 1950 version of the FLSA.

The elimination of exemptions to the wage and hour provision, which I propose, would alone add about 6 millions to those covered. This 6 million, however, is not in addition to the 9 million figure above.

I call attention to certain basic facts about our national economy which should be borne in mind when considering this legislation.

This proposed bill reestablishes the machinery in the 1938 act for the establishment of tripartite industry committees to recommend minimum rates for a particular industry which would be higher than the basic nationwide \$1.25 rate.

There are in my bill a number of fairly technical but quite important and highly practical revisions of the 1949 version which experience has proven to be necessary both from the standpoint of administrative feasibility and fair treatment for both employer and employees.

This bill would not affect a greater proportion of the total working force than did the original FLSA in 1938.

It would primarily affect industries whose wage standards have lagged and those employers who have failed to grant prevailing wage increases.

This proposed increase in the statutory hourly minimum from 75 cents to \$1.25 is certainly modest when compared with the rise in average hourly earnings of factory workers from 62 cents to \$1.79—June 1938 to March 1954—a step-up of \$1.17.

The cost of living for lower income groups has risen by more than 120 percent since the FLSA first became law.

Productivity in the American industry has been rising at the rate of \$3.25 to 3.5 percent per year per man-hour. This increase alone would justify the proposed increase in the statutory minimum wage.

The actual prevailing minimum wage in industry today is \$1.25 or higher. By increasing the statutory minimum wage in 1955, the Congress would stimulate and strengthen the entire American economy by eliminating remaining areas of substandard wages and by increasing purchasing power. The passage of the 1938 bill sparked an almost sensational upturn in our national economy. The effect of the 75-cent

minimum rate which became effective in 1950 was less dramatic, but its beneficial effect was pervasive and its total effect was most helpful. The stereotyped advance predictions about firms being forced out of business because of the requirement of paying 75 cents an hour simply did not materialize. Indeed, the great bulk of industry that was paying below 75 cents an hour voluntarily brought their wages into line when they saw that Congress was going to act to raise the statutory rate.

My principal justification, however, for introduction of this legislation is that from the standpoint of social ethics it is not possible to permit millions of workers to remain outside the protection of this law. Both social justice and sound economics require immediate revision and extension of the FLSA.

In his March 30 message to the Congress on foreign economic policy, President Eisenhower announced that it is now United States policy to refuse tariff reductions to products "made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country." The President also urged the raising of wages abroad by consultative procedures such as provided by the International Labor Organization.

In the conclusion of this message the President said that for our own security as a Nation our allies must become economically strong.

While I most certainly agree with all that the President says about the necessity for improving substandard wages abroad, these remarks apply with even greater force to our economy here at home. To keep America strong we must constantly strengthen the foundation of our economy. And that foundation is our purchasing power. The 75 cents minimum wage is out of date; it no longer provides adequate purchasing power; it no longer provides a decent American standard of living for that section of our population which is working for such substandard rates of pay.

I am introducing this bill at this time so that the terms of the act and its economic effect can be studied during the next several months, thus facilitating early hearings by the Labor Committees of the House and Senate.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### FOREIGN FUEL OIL

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to remind my colleagues of the news release under a London dateline announcing an agreement that will turn into the channels of world trade the great Iranian oil reserves.

When this trouble broke out between England and Iran it was necessary for the American companies that were in the cartel with the Anglo-Iranian oil interests to divert their production from Saudi Arabia and Iran to take care of the European markets. Once more this Iranian oil under their cartel arrangement will supply the European market. That means that Saudi Arabian and Iraq oil will be added to the great inflow of Venezuelan oil that has disrupted our domestic oil industry and threatened it.

I am just calling attention to the fact that the 84th Congress must give attention to this serious situation.

#### PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 9

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to inquire as to the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand while I was busy talking to someone consent was given to adjourn over until Monday, which is entirely agreeable to me, as the gentleman from Indiana had already spoken to me about it.

May I inquire with respect to the program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. In response to the gentleman's inquiry I may say first of all that today there are two rules outstanding which we expect to dispose of, together with the bills they make in order.

As the gentleman from Texas has pointed out we will then adjourn over until Monday.

The discharge petition on the postal pay bill, as I understand, will be called on Monday.

For next week, barring some unforeseen contingency, so far as I know there is no legislative program for the House to work on except conference reports.

I have just been informed by a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia that the District Committee has reported out a few bills which will be in order on Monday next, inasmuch as that is the calendar day for the consideration of the District of Columbia bills. So far as I know there is no serious controversy about any of those bills.

Private and Consent Calendars: Whether or not there will be a further call of the Private or Consent Calendars I do not know. I will not promise that there will be. It is possible that if there are measures that should be acted upon we could arrange to do that without a formal calling of those two calendars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield that I may address an inquiry to the majority leader?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.



Mr. GROSS. Will the discharge petition take precedence over all other legislation coming up on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I think it will, as I understand the rules. As a matter of fact, since the gentleman has mentioned that discharge petition, if the gentleman from Texas will yield—

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it ought to be pointed out to the membership that that discharge petition makes in order one of the most effective gag rules I have ever seen in my time. It prohibits all amendments except those offered by the committee. It limits debate to 1 hour.

There were some very bitter things said the other day when we called up the postal rate and pay bill under a motion to suspend the rules. Then we had 40 minutes' debate, and that was supposed to be too short a time. Under the discharge petition, of course, debate will be limited to 60 minutes instead of 40.

As far as I am concerned personally, in view of the fact that it does provide for the calling up of a bill under a gag rule, I trust some of the people who signed the petition will not complain hereafter if we bring out some so-called gag rules.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, the only way that can be prevented is to amend the rules of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; but one who puts a discharge petition on the desk assumes the primary responsibility for the form in which the rule is presented, as well as the discharge petition. Of course, those who sign the discharge petition, I take it, are under some obligation to know the sort of a rule which is provided.

Mr. RAYBURN. With reference to gag rules, it all depends on who is in the majority. We always complain when we are in the minority about gag rules, and the gentleman's party complained when they were in the minority, but we go right on gagging in more ways than one.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. In the consideration of the bill on Wednesday a week ago and in 40 minutes of that debate we had two important bills under consideration, the increase for postal workers and the increase in postage rates, whereas on Monday we will have an hour of debate on just one bill, the Corbett postal bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Only yesterday we passed a rather important bill with only 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. RAYBURN. We do that all the time.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas,

also the gentleman from Indiana, who has left the floor at this time. I do hope and trust that the leadership will see fit to bring out the Washita project, which was recommended by the President of the United States—it was No. 1 on his list in his budget message, and one that has been approved by the Senate. It is an emergency project, it is worthwhile, it has been reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I hope the House leadership will recognize the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to call up that bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has a very fine bill, and it should be passed.

#### AMENDING SECTION 405 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1953

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9077) to amend section 405 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953, to make available to the judges of such District the psychiatric and psychological services provided for in such section, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 405 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953 is amended by striking '(1) The probation officers' and inserting in lieu thereof '(1) In criminal cases, the judges of the district court and the probation officers.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 622 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 50 of the 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000 additional including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, following the word "thereof", insert "within the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Territory of the Virgin Islands, and British possessions in the Caribbean area."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 629 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 22 of the 83d Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed \$35,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$25,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 631 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 439, 83d Congress, incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1954, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise engaged.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

## CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER ROOM

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of inquiries about the location of the prayer room which was authorized under a resolution which I introduced about 2½ years ago, approved unanimously by the House last July 17, and by the Senate unanimously in May of this year. I am glad to announce that the Speaker has made room No. P-65 available for this purpose. It is just west of the rotunda on this level. I know the newspapermen will not believe me when I say that this is an announcement I would much prefer to make in executive session. They know that I appreciate publicity as much as anyone, but publicity should not be sought in this instance. I am making this announcement solely for the information of the Members. And it is an important announcement. I pray the indulgence of the newspapermen to that extent, but not to suggest, of course, that our personal feelings color any reports they make of the prayer room. I am well enough acquainted with their standards not to make that mistake. However, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that something was required of the press in this situation beyond the professional standards which they scrupulously maintain. They have been objective but they have been sensitive to the underlying considerations which motivated us. In the tradition of the American newsman they have given the story to the public and yet they have respected our desire to avoid exploiting this resolution. They have shown in this area of activity the same perception they have developed in political matters. It is not something I have just discovered about them. I recall, for example, a 1942 experience. My friend Ed Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, sent one of his reporters to cover a visit I made to the camp for Japanese-Americans transferred to my State. Their young people invited us to participate in a Christian service, and the reporter eagerly grasped the chance to add an account of this meeting to his story. The service began with the singing of Martin Luther's famous hymn, A Mighty Fortress. I was asked to speak. The Press-Scimitar article appearing next morning began:

It was an amazing experience attending a service in Arkansas of Japanese-Americans just removed from California, singing songs written by a German, out of a book published by Presbyterians, and listening to a Baptist politician speak.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCOMPTE] stressed the importance of the prayer room when the resolution was originally considered. I remember his words, "Mr. Speaker, this is a notable occasion." The Congress of the United States had never done anything like this before. But I want to confess to my colleagues that after it was done I was amazed at the complex problems that arose in connection with the establishment of the room for our personal use, this place of retreat and meditation. I found on examination that it involved a keener understanding of our patterns of government and the relation of religion to politics. The two are indeed

related. I think it was Disraeli, at least one of the great British statesmen, who, upon being invited to address an audience, was told upon arrival that he would be permitted to speak about anything except politics and religion. He said, "Finding that I was not permitted to speak of the two subjects of most importance to mankind, I promptly left the meeting."

I believe people might be surprised at the number of times men in these seats have prayed silently for themselves. I know that I have been inspired on occasions by an intimate opening of the mind of a colleague in reverently insisting that prayer is needed. What we want in the prayer room is a place of retreat where encouragement can be given to that attitude of reverence and meditation; where one can find the resources that lie outside himself.

I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that both the action of the Senate and of the House on this delicate subject has been accomplished in exactly the right way. I am personally indebted to the present distinguished Speaker of the House for his wise counsel and to the distinguished former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] for sound advice.

At first, one Member expressed reluctance. We are taught in personal petitions, he said, to seek a secret place. If that were taken literally, there would be no prayers in formal church services. It should not be taken literally, but in effect, it is a secret place. Privacy will be afforded. It is not a prominent room. It will be for the use of Members only and I am sure the public will recognize the physical limitations and will approve our decision.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. There is no emblem that would indicate that this meditation room is for the use of any particular creed or denomination or sect? That has been carefully avoided, has it not?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have the gentleman from Iowa bring out that fact. The gentleman will recall that with the third member of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ST. GEORGE], we carefully canvassed the matter of symbols. In all of our activities we have worked with Mr. Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, who has expressed a desire to equip the room in a way that will meet the highest standards.

I am anxious to have presented on this occasion a full account of progress on the room so I trust the House will bear with me.

I had a chance to show the room to one of our great church leaders recently and I asked him, "Can you help us with the symbols, particularly one that will represent our faith in God as the Father of all?" There is no ready answer to that question. The Bible itself should stand for that faith. But all of the symbols will be compatible with our belief in the separation of church and state and our complete commitment to the ideal of freedom of worship.

The resolution itself says that there shall be in the room a symbol of freedom of worship. I think the flag of the United States may best represent that guaranty, and the flag will be in an appropriate place.

In the same article in our Constitution in which freedom of worship is guaranteed, and in which the prohibition of the establishment of any official faith is stated clearly, there is a secure guaranty that there shall be no prohibition of the free exercise by an individual of his faith, and the two concepts are tied together. For that reason the emphasis is rightly upon the individual and this, Mr. Speaker, makes it possible for all faiths to share in the facility.

The central feature of the room will be a beautiful and attractive stained-glass window in subdued colors and of magnificent design—and I pause to mention the gentleman from California [Mr. HESTAND] for that contribution from his district. It is not only the gift of the company that manufactures the windows but also of the skilled workmen who have donated their services. In the design is a candle, the symbol of light, a scroll, with no visible words but the Architect tells me that it represents the Sermon on the Mount, with its message of mercy and of love and brotherhood—and then below an open book, the book of the law. These are all appropriate symbols, it seems to me.

I appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from Iowa in yielding to me. As evidence of the interest in this provision, I would like to refer to a conversation a few days ago with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who handed me the following quotation on prayer from a book he had just read:

To pray \* \* \*. It is so necessary and so hard. Hard not because it requires intellect or knowledge or a big vocabulary or special techniques, but because it requires of us humility. And that comes, I think, from a profound sense of one's brokenness, and one's need. Not the need that causes us to cry, "Get me out of this trouble, quick," but the need that one feels every day of one's life—even though one does not acknowledge it—to be related to something bigger than one's self, something more alive than one's self, something older and something not yet born, that will endure through time.

This is an excellent statement of our need.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are many things that have been done by this Congress of which I have been critical. I am happy to have this opportunity to rise to say that, in my opinion, one of the finest things that this Congress has done, one of the finest things that any Congress has done, or could do, is the fulfillment of the project so eloquently described by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]. He and his colleagues have devoted themselves wholeheartedly to a truly divine task, and the results they have brought about will be a lasting monument, not only to this Congress, but to this Government of ours which has ever been in the forefront of the



fight for human liberties and particularly for the right to worship God in accordance with the dictates of one's own conscience.

Without violating the concept of separation of church and state we here set a living example of how men of differing faiths can nevertheless live together as brothers under the one ever living God.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the establishment of a special room for prayer and meditation here in the Capitol of the United States is a most significant one. This is not the first or only recognition given to religion and to the things of the spirit. Every session of the House of Representatives and every session of the Senate of the United States is opened with a chaplain's prayer. The motto on the coins of the United States, "In God we trust," is a public affirmation of religious truth.

Religion and morality have long been recognized as good and necessary in themselves, but also as essential to the working of a democratic political system. George Washington's statement that religion and morality were the indispensable supports of political prosperity, have been accepted and repeated many times by both political and religious leaders in the United States. Whereas the first amendment clearly forbids the Federal Government from establishing a church, the amendment was not intended to create an irreligious or antireligious government. The Government has demonstrated, from the beginning of our national existence, a special and open concern for the religious life of the citizens of our country. Religious publications are given special consideration under postal-rate laws and regulations. Chaplains are provided for the men and women in the armed services, and chapels provided. The objective and rule has been to provide such service without discrimination—without special preference.

The goal of our democracy has not been uniformity or strict conformity, but rather it has been political unity, allowing for individual and group differences. Fundamental to our political philosophy is the fundamental respect of the dignity of every person as endowed with "unalienable rights" which no government may take away.

This whole American experience, as it relates to our religious freedom, has been admirably treated by Father John Courtney Murray in an article entitled "American Pluralism," appearing in *Thought* magazine.

Father Murray in his article points out that America has proved by experience that political unity and stability are possible without uniformity of religious belief and practice, and without the necessity of governmental restrictions on religion.

For a century and a half—

He points out—

the United States has displayed to the world the fact that political unity and stability are not inherently dependent on the common sharing of one religious faith.

This is the best argument, the argument from history, against those who argue that religious differences necessarily make for political differences and

instability, and also from experience the argument against those who argue that religious life will not flourish unless underwritten and prescribed by the state.

Father Murray points out moreover, that American experience demonstrates not only that there can be stable political unity in a society religiously pluralistic, but that political unity can be positively strengthened by the exclusion of religious differences from the area of governmental concern and authority. Religious differences and conflicts have never had more than an accidental and temporary significance in American politics. We have in America, Father Murray observes, consequently been saved from the disaster of ideological political parties.

The third and most striking aspect of the American experience, the article notes, is the fact that religion itself has benefited by our free institutions, by the maintenance of separation between church and state. Father Murray concludes with the observation that the goodness of the first amendment, as it has generally been interpreted and applied, is "manifest not only by political but also by religious experience;" that "by and large—for no historical record is without blots—it has been good for religion to have simply the right of freedom. This right is at the same time, the highest of privileges and it too has its price." That price is not envy and enmity, the price of privilege, he points out, but the price is sacrifice, labor, added responsibilities imposed by freedom.

It is my hope that the establishment of the common room will serve not only to symbolize the diversity that characterizes the United States, but that it will serve also as an instrument for the advancement of understanding, of tolerance, and truth.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, approval by both Houses of the establishment and furnishing of a room for meditation and prayer in the Capitol, causes a great many Members of the Congress much satisfaction.

Apparently many Members have felt this need for some time. In times of extra pressure and stress, mankind has always turned to the Almighty for help, strength, and guidance. The opportunity for quiet seclusion and meditation, convenient to the Houses of Congress, with suitable religious atmosphere and furnishings, but entirely nonsectarian, should be provided by this room.

The Capitol Architect has sufficient funds for refinishing, rearranging, and equipping the room, except, of course, for a stained glass window, seemingly an essential of such a room.

I am happy that the Judson Studios of Los Angeles, whose principals live in my district, saw fit on the very day that the resolution was offered, February 12, 1953, to call me on the long-distance phone, offering to donate such a window. This is more than a company offer. The highly skilled workmen, several of them immigrants from Europe, have insisted that they donate their time as a contribution not only to their adopted country, but to the high purpose of this project.

Several designs for the stained glass window have been suggested. The committee had the suggestion that the window depict various scenes enacting the Sermon on the Mount. In order to make it strictly nonsectarian, the studio has in mind various instances in American history in which the help of the Almighty was invoked by prayer—Washington at Valley Forge, and so forth. Final design, of course, must be approved by the committee under the direction of the Capitol Architect. Work, however, is to proceed immediately in the hope that the room may be dedicated upon the convening of the 84th Congress.

I wish to congratulate the sponsor of the resolution, the Honorable Brooks HAYS, of Arkansas, and the then chairman of the House Prayer Group, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, for their assistance to the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTÉ, of Iowa, chairman of the House Administration Committee, and his committee, as well as Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, in making effective the resolution.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject now under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. LECOMPTÉ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 632) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations contemplated by clause 16, rule XI, incurred by the Committee on Rules, not to exceed \$2,500, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FAVORING WAIVER OF STATE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS IN ELECTIONS OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS

Mr. LECOMPTÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) favoring the waiver of State residence requirements in elections of Federal officials.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the concurring)*, That the Congress expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment

of appropriate legislation to enable a person to vote for Federal officials, when such person would be eligible to vote for such Federal officials but for the residence requirements of the State in which he is residing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we have an explanation of what this resolution provides?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi that this resolution was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS]. It recommends without any other provision that the several States negotiate among themselves and negotiate to make an arrangement whereby a citizen who moves from one State to another may be permitted to vote in the State of his original residence until such time as he has established residence in the State to which he has moved. It is purely a matter of recommending negotiation to the States.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, how long can this condition or status go on?

Mr. LECOMPTE. It just recommends that the States consider that in negotiations with each other. There is no time limit on it. It has already been done in some States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the idea of the Federal Government recommending to the States how to handle their voting laws.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is entirely a recommendation. The gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee, will tell you that.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is very much like some of the memorializing statements that we get from our State legislatures. I might just say, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that really the resolution is somewhat meaningless because it is merely a recommendation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What prompted a resolution of this kind?

Mr. LECOMPTE. It was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as I say, who has found that a considerable number of people are losing the right to vote by moving from one State to the other and not being permitted to vote until they have had a year's residence in the new State to which they have moved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### REFERENCE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 301

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has found itself with House Resolution 301, which seems to have the elements of a claim and the committee voted to ask to have this bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction

of claims. I have spoken to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], and it is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There was no objection.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I at this time extend my remarks and include a very short table which shows the amount of money that has been allocated from the contingent fund for investigation by special and regular committees of recent Congresses, including the 82d and 83d Congress up to this time, and showing the amount of money that was left unexpended. Of course, the picture will not be complete as to the 83d Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

*Appropriations for investigations  
(House of Representatives)*

Congress	Appropriation	Balance
79th.....	\$1,270,219.19	\$836,456.71
80th.....	1,887,204.03	532,792.37
81st.....	1,678,987.90	487,150.99
82d.....	2,864,500.00	634,891.63
83d.....	2,654,550.00	1,092,208.19
Pending:		
H. Res. 622.....	25,000.00	-----
H. Res. 629.....	25,000.00	-----
H. Res. 631.....	25,000.00	-----
H. Res. 682.....	2,500.00	-----
Total.....	2,732,050.00	-----

<sup>1</sup> June 30.

#### HILARIO CAMINO MONCADO

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2887) for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hilario Camino Moncado shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hilario Camino Moncado and Diana Toy Moncado shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of

the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado and Diana Toy Moncado."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING HATCH ACT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7745) to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. However, it might be wise if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will give some brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does not the gentleman permit consideration of the bill, and then have this discussion under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this extend to State employees?

Mr. CORBETT. Let me answer the gentleman from Texas first. This is a very minor change in the law. Presently, when a State employee is found to have violated the Hatch Act, the penalty is fixed at 18 months separation from State employment. The Commission has long wanted the right of some discretion regarding penalties because even a minor offense like wearing a campaign button could result in 18 months separation. So the bill provides first that the punishment for violation can extend from zero up to 18 months, depending on the nature of the offense. Secondly, it does add a protection to the rights of the individual State employee to exercise his citizenship privileges. That is all it does.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this extend to State employees appointed by a State administering State laws, even though they may be partially financed by Federal funds?

Mr. CORBETT. No, it does not. It deals only with the State employees who are not under civil service. It gives them protection rather than extending any further limitations on them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman what prompted legislation of this type?

Mr. CORBETT. The very fact that the Federal Government, through the Civil Service Commission, could, if it



wanted to, put some 327,000 employees in jeopardy on their positions. Secondly, the thing which prompted it most keenly is the fact that the penalty is cruel and harsh, requiring 18 months separation from employment with the State, regardless of how minor the offense.

Mr. BURLESON. Particularly, for the benefit of the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. WILLIAMS], the law now brings State employees under the provisions and penalties of the Hatch Act, who are serving a State agency, which agency is in whole or in part financed by public funds. Is that a correct statement of the present law?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. BURLESON. As I understand the measure proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, State employees are removed from the general provisions of the Hatch Act, where they are not paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. CORBETT. Let me say, and I particularly want to address myself to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] because I think we are doing what he wants done, rather than the opposite. All prohibitions against coercion or influence are retained. We are simply saying to the individual that he has a right to exercise his full rights as a citizen. That is all. He has no right to coerce and no right to influence. These prohibitions are held. I think we are doing what the gentleman would like to have us do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, if one of these State employees were a political button of any party or any candidate, they would be violating the law, as it now stands.

Mr. CORBETT. And subject to removal for 18 months. If the governor of a State, for instance, would ask an appointed Cabinet officer to make an address for him in a political campaign, he would be in violation.

I might say to you that even if his secretary addressed a letter, as this law is now written, they would be in violation of the act and subject to being suspended for 18 months by order of the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New

York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. TABER, Mr. CANNON, and, on chapter 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, and 13, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and Mr. GARY; on chapter 3, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. BOW, and Mr. ROONEY; on chapter 5, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. BUDGE, and Mr. FERNANDEZ; on chapter 6, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. WHITTEN; on chapter 7, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. NORRELL; on chapter 8, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. JONAS of North Carolina, and Mr. THOMAS; on chapters 9 and 10, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. RABAUT.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### LABELING OF PACKAGES CONTAINING FOREIGN-PRODUCED TROUT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 687 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2033) relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and then will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 687, which will make in order the consideration of the bill, S. 2033, relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout.

House Resolution 687 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, basically this bill is intended to protect the small American trout producing industry against unfair foreign competition. According to the report on this bill various restaurants throughout the country are advertising on their menus "Rocky Mountain Trout," or "Eastern Brook Trout," when actually the trout they serve is foreign produced and imported into the United States. The contention of the domestic trout producers is that over a long period of years during which great effort and money has been devoted to improving the product, the American producers of trout have built up a reputation for their product under the name of "Rocky Mountain Trout," or "Eastern Brook Trout." These domestic farmers of trout now claim that the misrepresentation of the origin of the trout by restaurants is injuring the reputation of the domestic trout as well as the market for it.

Specifically S. 2033 would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that the packages of trout be stamped and labeled with the name of the country from which the trout came.

The second major provision in this bill would make it mandatory for restaurants to have the country from which the trout came printed on the menu in order that the public may know just what type of trout they are eating and therefore be able to judge the merits of the fish accordingly. If the restaurant does not use menus then it is mandatory for the restaurant to have displayed prominently within the restaurant itself the country from which the fish came.

I think that it should be noted here that the bill, if it is passed, will not go into effect for 6 months after the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, as the report on this bill points out, there is no limitation in this piece of legislation on the importation of trout from abroad. Neither does the bill regulate the manner or conditions under which foreign trout must be produced in order to qualify for importation into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly approve of this bill; it not only protects our domestic producer of trout from unfair competition but safeguards the trout-producing industry which stocks our streams as well as supplies our tables with this delicious fish.

I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the House will pass this bill which means so much to an important domestic industry.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I guess it may be said that this bill sounds a little fishy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is worthy of the consid-

eration of the Members of the House. I would be reluctant to designate as ridiculous any measure that comes out of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I will therefore state to you what this bill does, and you may draw your own conclusions.

The bill made in order by this rule amends the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and it does two things.

Of course, we might have a lot of important things to do around here in the last few days of the session but it seems we have got to deal with the question of fish and how the restaurants shall run their establishments in connection with fish. I thought they did a very good job themselves, but it seems now that we know more about their business than they know themselves.

This bill requires that trout, just one class of fish, must carry a label on the package showing what country they come from. That is not so objectionable, but when they get to the restaurant operator he has got to put on his menu the origin of that fish; in other words, he has to show the place of their birth, and their pedigree on the menu if he does not want to go to jail.

That might strike some people as being rather absurd. We ought not to do that to the restaurant and hotel operators. We have a very fine restaurant operator here in the House. He looks like he has been successful in running a restaurant. I believe he is. I believe he knows how to do it, and I think we ought to let him go on and run his business in the good old American way without telling him what kind of fish he has got to put on the menu and what the pedigree of that fish is, the point of origin, who was the father and grandmother, and where it was spawned.

Now, ought we take serious time to do a thing like that? Or ought we to defeat this rule that never should have been brought here?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I have not very much time. I will yield later. Let me first finish my statement.

Fish is a very important subject. There happen to be about six classes of trout. I could not pronounce the names and neither could you, but there are about six kinds of trout. There are about 6,000 classes of fish. Why should we discriminate against the trout? Why should we not make the restaurant menu show the pedigree of every fish, of all the 6,000 kinds of fish spawned in the world? Why discriminate against trout?

Seriously, I want to say that the trout fishermen, the people who raise these trout, are doing themselves a disservice. By the way, they say they are trout farms. Of course, "farm" is a very popular term around the House here and I suppose they call them trout farms because they think that gives it the farmer appeal and that everybody is going to vote for it because it is going to help the farmer, so they call these lakes trout farms. They raise trout. It is a very worthy enterprise. But they are going to cut their own throats.

Take our good friend from Chicago who has been successful running a business. He is a pretty sound, hardheaded old businessman. He may love trout and all that, and he wants to help all of these folks, but here is what is going to happen. Primarily he is a businessman. So when you pass a law saying that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] has got to put the pedigree of the trout on his menu or go to jail, do you know what John is going to do? John is going to quit selling trout. These trout people are fixing to ruin their own business, yet they do not realize it.

If we want to provide that foreign fish brought in here shall be labeled as to pedigree, that is all right, but to say that a restaurant keeper has got to guarantee the pedigree of every fish he puts on a plate he serves to you and me, is that not ridiculous? This bill would ruin the trout farmers. It would stop people from selling trout.

Unfortunately, I have to leave the House in just a few moments. But I want to ask my friends to do one thing for me. You know, a lot of you folks come down to Virginia. We have a specialty in Virginia. That is, Virginia ham. Restaurants put on their menus "Virginia ham." You order Virginia ham thinking you are getting a nice piece of Virginia ham, but when you get it, you know it never got any nearer to Virginia than a week before when it was murdered in Chicago, smoked, and sent down to Virginia a few days before. Yet, they call it Virginia ham. Do you not think it is just as important to protect my Virginia ham as it is to say what kind of fish, what his pedigree is, where it came from, where he was born, and where he died? They ought to protect my Virginia ham. I want you to offer an amendment to protect Virginia ham. You are all interested in Virginia ham.

We have a number of different kinds of shrimp from various parts of the country. Why not say where those shrimp came from? We have some very fine oysters, Lynnhaven Bay oysters. If they are going to serve these Lynnhaven Bay oysters why do we not make them say that they are Lynnhaven Bay oysters?

Mr. Speaker, let us forget about this fish business a while and get down to some serious business.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Virginia and I usually find myself wholeheartedly in agreement with him. However, he has oversimplified the matter which is before the House.

Last year in the United States there were 17½ million people who bought fishing licenses. Most of them wanted to fish for trout. There are 325 so-called trout farms, to which the gentleman referred, 325 in the United States. They are one of the most important sources of supply for restocking the trout streams in this country.

Another example of oversimplification: Thirty-one State fish and game commissions wrote to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee urging

the adoption of this legislation. If these 325 small businesses in the United States are forced out of existence, then either the States or the Federal Government will have to replace the production of eggs, fingerlings, and of legal sized trout which are planted in the streams of this Nation.

There is another feature to this. We have here a practice which is downright dishonest. All of the manufactured products that come into this country from foreign nations must bear a label on them "Made in Japan" or "Made in Germany." These trout are shipped in frozen, in great big boxes, and as the gentleman from Massachusetts remarked the other day, you cannot get trout eggs out of a frozen trout. They ship them in these great big boxes, and on the outside of the box it will say "Produce of Denmark" or "Produce of Japan." But, you open up the box, and what does it have inside of it? Individual bundles of trout. And, incidentally, they are not even the same species of fish that are raised in this country. But, it will say on the package containing maybe a dozen trout, "Rocky Mountain rainbow trout," "Sierra Mountain trout," "Eastern brook trout," a deliberate attempt to deceive the people of this country who want to eat that type of fish.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. When the application was made for a rule on this bill and the testimony was adduced, the thing that concerned me was why the sportsmen would be interested in this particular legislation. My mind is perfectly open. I am seeking information. Bear in mind that in a good many States—I know it is true in my State—trout is a game fish. I speak now of fresh-water trout, of course. It is a game fish, and it is not permitted to be taken commercially. They cannot be served in the various restaurants of the State. Therefore, it would seem to me that from a sportsmen's angle, the sportsmen would be opposed to this bill rather than endorsing it. Would the gentleman throw some light on that question?

Mr. BUDGE. I shall be happy to attempt to. I think the resolutions which were considered by the committee and which are part of the record bear the endorsement of the National Wildlife Federation, the Isaak Walton League, and the endorsement of 31 fish and game departments as well as several sporting magazines. They are interested in it for this reason:

The streams of the various States are stocked normally over a 60- or 90-day period during the calendar year. During the remainder of the year, in order for the fish farms to stay in business, they must sell trout on the commercial market. It is a year-round operation. They cannot operate for just 2 or 3 months. But a great many of the States and a great many individual organizations, sporting organizations, and a great many private individuals buy eggs and fingerling trout and legal-sized trout to put into their streams and lakes,



and they buy them from these commercial hatcheries. They augment the State and the Federal hatcheries in that regard, and that is where the sportsmen's interest comes in.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I wonder if he could tell us how many States prohibit the sale of trout commercially.

Mr. BUDGE. Well, I notice that the gentleman just said that his State prohibited it. I am also informed that the State of Virginia prohibits the sale of any trout in a public eating house. So I cannot understand why the gentleman from Virginia would be too excited about it, in view of the fact that you cannot sell any kind of trout in his State, whether it came from Virginia, Denmark, Pennsylvania, Idaho, Japan, or wherever they did come from.

Mr. COLMER. I may say that that is not true in my State. As I understand it, in my State, trout may not be taken for commercial purposes, but that does not prevent our purchase of imported trout. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. The State of Virginia goes even further than that and prohibits the sale of it in any public eating house, which, as I have said, goes a lot farther than this bill. It seems to me, it is one thing to say that we are going to have trade all over the world which will be beneficial to everybody. This bill does not in any way attempt to prohibit the importation of a foreign product. It does not attempt to put any tariff on it. It simply says that if you are going to sell that product in the United States, be fair about it; do not attempt to sell it as an American product. I think somewhere along the line we have got to take a look at the little fellow in this country who is trying to stay in business. If he goes out of business, you are going to have 17½ million trout fishermen in this country who are going to want to know why. Incidentally, those 17½ million trout fishermen buy an awful lot of rubber boots. They burn a lot of gasoline. They buy a lot of meals. They represent probably the greatest sports recreation in the United States. Baseball rates about 14th compared with trout fishing.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the House will see fit to approve the resolution and the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill came before the Committee on Rules, I was somewhat amazed and puzzled about the mechanics of enforcing this measure, if it is enacted into law. Over the weekend I happened to be back home in my district and I was approached by a number of people who own restaurants. I believe one of those restaurants is known throughout the Nation. It is right at the edge of Chicago on a main highway, Phil Schmidt's Restaurant, which is known as a great fish and steak house. Mr. and Mrs. Schmidt, the proprietors, talked to me about this legislation. They said if this bill is enacted into law it would cause great confusion and redtape in the operation of their restaurant. They sell a great many brands of fish. They would have to put on extra help in order to regulate their menus. They

were very much aroused over the possibility of this bill becoming a law. Of course, if this bill would affect their restaurant, it would affect every restaurant that uses a menu in selling their food. It would involve a great deal of redtape in the operation of all restaurants.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Would the gentleman be kind enough to explain what that additional redtape would be, and what would be the great burden that would be placed upon those restaurants? That is difficult for me to understand.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not a restaurant man. I merely have the word of the proprietors of several restaurants in my district of what would happen if they tried to carry out the provisions of this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would not an obvious case be that if you had a restaurant that served both domestic and imported trout the owner would have to follow the trout all the way through to be sure that he served the kind indicated on the menu?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Is it not a fact that you would have to trace the ancestry of the fish that he was putting on the table in order to comply with the law?

Mr. MADDEN. I think that is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is there anything in the law that would require them to print this information in the English language?

Mr. MADDEN. The bill does not set out any specific regulations.

Mr. McCARTHY. When it comes to Japanese trout, they might just put down one of the oriental symbols. Would that satisfy them?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know. I am not the author of this legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the gentleman think the bill ought to go into that eventuality?

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman is correct.

I think one of the things that scares the average restaurant proprietor is this section, quote: "The significance of making this a prohibited act is that section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with a few exceptions in certain cases for acts done in good faith, makes the commission of such a prohibited act a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or not more than \$1,000 fine or both for the first offense. This section makes repeated violations felonies pun-

ishable by imprisonment for not more than 3 years or by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or both such imprisonment and fine." That would scare the average restaurant proprietor because it would expose him to unnecessary and malicious prosecutions on an offense where possibly he might not be violating the law with criminal intent.

Let me call your attention to another fact. If this law were passed it would mean that the Food and Drug Administration would have to have a great number of people added to their force in order to enforce the law. As I understand, Congress in this session reduced the appropriation of the Food and Drug Administration. My information is that the food and drug department of our Government today is deplorably undermanned for inspectors to go around inspecting foods and drugs and other necessities. If the department is called upon now to put on additional help in order to patrol the restaurants to learn whether or not they are serving a certain type of fish, I think it is an unfair infliction to impose on the department and restaurants of our country.

I might also mention another angle in this connection. It generally is the American inclination when you go into a restaurant and order something imported to think it is just a little bit better than the domestic type. Of course, they charge more for most of these imported goods. Nevertheless, I am afraid it might end to defeat what the trout people are attempting to accomplish. People might go into a restaurant where imported trout is being sold and say, "I would rather have that than the domestic trout." So it might hurt the domestic trout business considerably. Furthermore some hotels and restaurants if they were exposed to this ban might refuse to sell any brand of trout.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I doubt very much what the gentleman is saying, and I have a very high regard for the gentleman's opinion. Nevertheless, it is plain that when they ship these trout in here in refrigerated cases and mark them "Montana trout" or "Idaho trout" or "Colorado trout" or some other kind of trout, they recognize immediately that the American people want domestic trout.

Mr. MADDEN. I get the gentleman's point.

Mr. GAVIN. That is misrepresentation.

Mr. MADDEN. I might state that that could be avoided by having the original package labeled as to the source from which the trout or other fish came.

Mr. GAVIN. That is what they are trying to do.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana with regard to this rule, which I believe is more or less an open rule, whether or not if the pending resolution were to be adopted I should have an opportunity

to offer an amendment which would include our Brooklyn Gowanus Canal guppies and Prospect Park bullfrogs in the provisions of this bill. Would such an amendment be in order?

Mr. MADDEN. Maybe such an amendment would be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not think this legislation would be before the House if these restaurants ever got around to serving Mississippi catfish. If they ever ate Mississippi catfish, they would never want this trout.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I include this telegram:

WHITING, IND., August 1, 1954.  
Representative RAY J. MADSEN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Restaurant owners this district urge you to do everything possible to avoid passage of S. 2033 now scheduled for House action. This bill would establish dangerous precedent. Letter follows explaining.

PETER C. SMIDT,  
Vice President, Phil Smidt & Son,  
Inc.; President, Lake County, Indiana Restaurant Association.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that every restaurant in the United States must print on its menus the name of the area from which the trout comes, and if they do not have menus, they must put placards or conspicuous signs on the walls of the restaurant indicating the geographical area from which the trout came. What will eventually happen if we pass a bill of this character where we force signs indicating: "Idaho trout," "Colorado trout," "Danish trout," "Canadian trout," and so on? We are encouraging American producers to demand identical restrictions. Finally we will force restaurateurs and hotel men to put on their menus Cuban sugar, Mexican shrimp, Italian olive oil, Brazilian coffee, Canadian salmon, Spanish onions, Haiti beets, Portuguese sardines, Irish potatoes. Everyone and his brother would want protection against foreign competition. The menu will be cluttered with all sorts of geographical terminology. And if the restaurant proprietors do not print menus, they would have to plaster their walls with the names of almost every nation on the globe. Remember this too. How in thunder are you going to enforce a ridiculous law of this character? The Pure Food and Drug official appeared before the committee and said that there were no less than 525,000 eating places or restaurants in this Nation. I do not know how many hotels there are with their coffee shops and their restaurants—probably another 25,000 or 30,000 making perhaps a total of 550,000 places where you can eat. How are you going to enforce a provision like this? The Pure Food and Drug official who testified said it would be woefully impossible

for the Pure Food and Drug Division to enforce this statute. He said:

It is the view of the Department that the value to patrons of public eating places of knowing that the trout served is of foreign origin would not justify the substantial cost of adequate regulation.

Over the years, in an effort to give the most public protection possible with its limited funds, the Food and Drug Administration has given first attention to those matters which directly affect the public health with next attention to the violations involving filth, decomposition, and insanitation. This has meant that the purely economic aspects of enforcement have given very limited attention. Present indications are that because of a further reduced budget investigation of economic violations will have to be largely discontinued, this fiscal year, and that some work designed to keep filth out of food will have to be stopped. Decreasing the amount of attention to the health and sanitation aspects of enforcement in favor of the enforcement of this measure if it were to become law could not, in our opinion, be justified. The Department must therefore respectfully recommend against the enactment of these bills.

Beyond that, if the restaurateur or hotel man does not satisfy the provisions of the act, what happens to him? He goes to jail for a year and/or he pays a fine of \$1,000. I have been informed by the Hotelmen's Association and the National Association of Restaurant Owners that they are not going to sell trout and that they are going to instruct all of their members to be very cautious and to refrain wherever possible from the sale of trout. So the proponents of this bill are just going to be "hoist on their own petard"—they are not going to sell more trout, they are going to sell less trout.

We have not only the Pure Food and Drug Administration opposing it. The State Department opposes it and the Department of the Interior opposes this bill. We have three branches of the executive opposing this bill. I wonder whether the leaders and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who abet passage of this bill are going to follow the administration. The administration apparently does not want this bill and we, on this side, predominantly do not want the bill either.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Will the gentleman from New York explain why the State Department is opposed to this bill?

Mr. CELLER. Because it violates the treaty we have with Denmark. It violates the treaty we have with Canada. It violates treaties that we have with other countries because they must give equal treatment to the importers of various products equal to the treatment that they give to those who process and sell domestic articles. This particular bill violates that provision and for that reason it is a violation of a treaty and they of the State Department are unalterably opposed to the bill.

But, I might say in closing, this is apparently time for strange and bizarre bills.

Last week it was the frying pan bill. This week it is the trout bill. We seem to be going from fish to the frying pan.

I am informed that the bill passed unanimously in the other body to please one particular Senator who was running for reelection. I understand that many Members on this side are having their pictures taken with the President to get reelected. They are seeking to ride in on the coattails of the President. Now we are having one Senator riding in on the tail of a fish so that he can get reelected.

The representative of the Department of the Interior objected to the bill, as follows:

I recommend against enactment of the proposed legislation.

The bills would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to prohibit the sale, offering for sale, possession for sale, or serving of trout produced outside the United States, its Territories or possessions, unless the trout is packaged, wrapped, and clearly labeled to indicate its foreign origin and to require that in serving such trout the menu of the eating place indicate the name of the country where the trout was produced.

The exact purpose of the bills is somewhat difficult to determine, although it may be assumed that they are intended to aid the marketing of domestic, hatchery-raised trout. In this connection, it should be noted that the requirement of having each fish wrapped individually probably would raise the cost per pound of imported trout by only a few cents. The present differential in wholesale price between domestically raised trout and the imported, hatchery-raised trout is around 40 cents per pound. Thus, the additional cost would be absorbed easily and the imported trout still would undersell domestically produced trout. The question of whether the requirement that all eating places indicate on the menu the origin of the trout being served would affect in any way their consumption is equally difficult to determine. In some instances, at least, the labeling of a product as having been produced in a foreign country seems to enhance its popularity with the consuming public.

Here is the opposing statement—in part—of the representative of the State Department:

The bill provides that each part of the contents of each package of imported trout be wrapped separately and the country or origin of the trout be stated on each wrapper. The bill also provides that each public eating place serving imported trout shall indicate on its menu or by means of a conspicuous notice the foreign country in which the trout was produced.

By providing special conditions applicable only to imported and not to domestic products, this bill is inconsistent with reciprocal international commitments which this Government has obtained for the purpose of protecting the interests of American exporters in foreign markets. The United States has negotiated treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation and other international agreements with many countries, some of which are producers of trout for export, containing provisions to the effect that products of either party shall be accorded, within the territories of the other party, national treatment in all matters affecting internal taxation, sale, distribution, storage and use, that is, treatment of the foreign product equal in these respects to that accorded to the domestic product. The United States Government, since soon after its establishment, has sought such reciprocal commitments from other countries to assure to American nationals the opportunity to engage in international trade on an equitable basis. The proposed bill would require the United States, inconsistently with such commitments, to deny national treatment to one class of imported goods. If additional requirements to indicate the origin of trout were considered



desirable, such requirements could be imposed on domestically produced trout and foreign trout alike, without any departure from the established policy of the United States to accord national treatment to the goods of friendly foreign countries.

The Danish Government indicated that Danish trout is sold in competition principally with other imported foods, such as Mexican shrimp, Cuban lobster tails, Japanese frog legs, etc. The treatment required in the bill for trout would thus create a special handicap for the foreign sellers of trout in meeting the competition of these other imported foods.

While there seems to be a real question as to the reasonableness of undertaking the administrative burden of enforcing compliance with so special a regulation in the very large number of eating places in the United States, this aspect of the bill does not fall within the purview of this Department. However, because of the probable adverse effect on friendly countries and because of the conflict with United States trade policies and commitments, the Department recommends against enactment of H. R. 4201.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to the rule. This bill has a fishy stench that could be smelled from Maine to California. Even the New York Fulton Fish Market smells like perfume in comparison.

There has been great pressure on the Rules Committee to get this bill out of the committee. I asked for permission to testify before the Rules Committee to indicate my opposition to this bill. Somehow or other, all of a sudden the Rules Committee had an executive session and I was foreclosed from indicating my opposition to this bill. I was not given an opportunity to express my feelings.

There is also another strange and unusual thing about this bill, and that is the report of the committee. If you have had an opportunity to look at the report you will find that it contains only the pros and not the cons. The opposition is not indicated in the report. This report contains the favorable opinions of the Sport Fishing Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, Outdoor Life, and other similar opinions, but not the opposition that has been indicated by the Interior Department; not the opposition that has been indicated by the State Department, and not the opposition that has been indicated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. That is something unusual. We do not see that very often. We usually get a clear picture of the pros and cons.

In my own humble opinion, if we are foolish enough to pass this bill, and I think the Members of this House are fully familiar with its purposes, I do not think the President will sign it, because of the opposition of those departments.

Because of the limited time, there has been some question as to why the different departments have objected.

I want to read into the RECORD the opposition of the State Department. This was a reply to me in answer to a

question I posed to the Department. This letter is dated July 29:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, July 29, 1954.

The Honorable PAUL A. FINO,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FINO: Reference is made to your letter of July 27, 1954, requesting the views of the Department of State regarding the trout-labeling bill, S. 2033.

The bill as passed last year by the Senate and reported on June 11, 1954, with minor amendments by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (H. Rept. No. 1850), provides that imported trout offered for sale in the United States shall be packaged and that each package shall state the country of origin of the trout. The bill also provides that each public eating place serving imported trout shall indicate on its menu or by means of a conspicuous notice the foreign country in which the trout were produced. In responding to an inquiry from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Department of State, on June 26, 1953, recommended against enactment of S. 2033 because it would conflict with United States foreign trade policies and commitments and because of the probably adverse effects it would have upon our relations with foreign countries.

The United States has negotiated treaties and other agreements with many countries, some of which are producers of trout for export, containing provisions to the effect that products of either party shall be accorded within the territories of the other party national treatment in all matters affecting internal taxation, sale, distribution, storage and use; that is, treatment of the foreign product no less favorable than that accorded to the domestic product. In conflict with these commitments, the proposed bill would deny national treatment to one class of imported goods, in that it would require the packaging and labeling of imported trout but not of domestically produced trout. However, it would impose special marking requirements, such as those relating to the serving of imported trout in restaurants, going far beyond the general marketing provisions in section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in a manner generally inconsistent with the purpose of the provisions in treaties and agreements with other countries.

It is also the view of the Department that these provisions, if enacted, would adversely affect the United States trade of a number of friendly countries. The provisions of the bill would in a number of ways discourage the use of imported trout. The packaging and labeling requirements would increase marketing costs and possibly the ultimate selling price of foreign trout. The requirements with respect to menus and notices may be annoying and troublesome to implement and may also result in additional expense to restaurants serving such trout. Denmark has on more than one occasion expressed its concern to the Department regarding this bill. Its aide-memoires have pointed out that the proposed legislation would hamper the Danish trout export trade with the United States and that this trade represents an important source of Danish dollar earnings. Japan, another important exporter of trout to the United States, would also find its dollar earnings adversely affected. Canada has also expressed its concern over the restrictive nature of the bill. The economic welfare and continued goodwill and support of these countries are essential to the security objectives of the United States, and their purchases of Amer-

ican goods contribute to our own economic well-being.

Sincerely yours,  
THURSTON B. MORTON,  
Assistant Secretary  
(For the Secretary of State).

I also have a reply to my inquiry to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of that Department, said by letter to me dated August 2, 1954:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINO: In response to your letter of July 27, 1954, concerning the position of this Department on S. 2033, we are pleased to enclose herewith for your information a copy of our report of July 6, 1953, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, recommending against enactment of the bill, and a copy of the prepared statement of Mr. Malcolm R. Stephens of our Food and Drug Administration presented to a subcommittee of the House committee on July 7, 1953.

There has been no change in our position.

What does this bill propose to do? Well, first it requires any foreign trout to be properly packaged and labeled. The existing law takes care of that because it specifically requires proper labeling. So there is no need for any duplication of our laws. Secondly, the bill requires every restaurant in the United States to print on its menu the name of the country from which the trout comes. That in and of itself is objectionable. But when we say that if the restaurant owner does not do these things, he is risking the possibility of going to jail and being fined, if by mistake he lists on his menu the wrong fish, then we are going too far in trying to help the trout raisers.

This is a bad bill. It is bad legislation and should not be passed. I trust the Members of the House will vote against the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members that on yesterday Miss Jerolyn Ross, 17 years old, a constituent of mine the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Ross of Meridian, Miss., was elected president of Girls Nation.

Anyone who knows Miss Ross, her personality and her ability, will know why she received such an honor. Her distinguished young friends were immediately impressed by her knowledge of the many issues to be considered by Girls Nation. After her nomination for president by the nationalist party, her election became certain as other delegates had an opportunity to meet her and hear her presidential program.

Miss Ross is typical of the fine young women of Mississippi, and I am especially proud of the recognition which has been given her. We need have no worries about our Nation's future as long as we

produce such fine young leaders as Jerolyn Ross.

The American Legion is to be commended for its sponsorship of the Girls and Boys Nation program. The fine Mississippi department of the Legion and auxiliary are certainly entitled to the greatest credit for girl's and boy's State programs it has conducted in Mississippi, the action of the national groups is proof of the value of the program in Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD], that I have no desire to detract from the attractive and talented young lady, Miss Ross, who has received this signal honor. On the contrary, I desire to felicitate and congratulate her as well as to congratulate my distinguished and able colleague in whose district she resides, but I hope that it will not be amiss for me to also call attention to the fact that last week when the Boys' Nation convention was held here in Washington that it was another outstanding young Mississippian who was honored by being elected president of that organization. I refer of course to Eddie Perry, a constituent of mine, whose home is down on the beautiful gulf coast of Mississippi, Bay St. Louis.

So, we have the unusual situation here of an outstanding boy and an outstanding girl being selected to head up these two splendid youth organizations both from one State, the great State of Mississippi which my colleague [Mr. WINSTEAD] and I have the honor to represent here in the Nation's House of Representatives. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if a parallel situation has ever existed or for that matter ever will again.

Mississippi has traditionally been hailed as a great agricultural State, a rural State, if you please. But what my colleague [Mr. WINSTEAD] and I are emphasizing here is that while we may grow fine cotton, corn, and other agricultural crops down in Mississippi, that our truly great crop is the crop of splendid young men and young women. I am sure that our colleagues here would pardon us if we seem to take, as we do, pride in this historic event which happened here in the Nation's Capital, within the past week. All Mississippians are proud of Jerolyn Ross, of Meridian, Miss., and Eddie Perry, of Bay St. Louis, Miss. I am sure that you join with me in an expression of approval to that great patriotic organization, the American Legion, in sponsoring these splendid youth organizations.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point to insert in my remarks an article regarding Miss Jerolyn Ross, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning.

(The article referred to follows:)

JEROLYN ROSS, 17, HEADS GIRLS NATION  
(By Patty Cavin)

The rafters of American University's Hurst Building were raised at least a foot and a half in midair last evening by shouts, roars,

and screams of "Hooray," as members of Girls Nation welcomed their new president, Jerolyn Everette Ross, of Meridian, Miss., candidate of the minority Nationalist Party. Miss Claudia Anderson Liebrecht, of Manhasset, Long Island, took vice presidential honors.

The 98 teen-age delegates, here for a week of citizenship study under the sponsorship of the American Legion Auxiliary, sat on pins and needles through an 8 p. m. speech by Miss Bertha Adkins, assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee. (Miss Adkins obligingly cut her talk short to a fact-packed 15 minutes.)

There was a moment of dazed silence when the returns were announced by Mrs. J. Pat Kelly, of Atlanta, Ga., chairman of the Girls State Committee. The tall, sun-tanned 17-year-old president, and former governor of the Magnolia Girls State, let out a howl, then broke into a flood of tears. First to dash up and give her a hug was the defeated candidate of the Federalist Party, pretty blonde, Ann Davis, of Bountiful, Utah. "I pledge you my complete support," she said.

Miss Ross' election as president climaxed 3 days of rigorous campaigning on the part of the 98 delegates. They set up a mock government when they arrived last Saturday, complete with a two-party system. As one delegate dutifully explained, "There's really no difference between the Federalists and the Nationalists. We're both against apathy."

The new "Veep," Miss Claudia Liebrecht, formerly served as secretary of state and chairman of the platform committee at the recent Girls State convention in New York. She defeated Miss Mary Froebe, of Charlotte, N. C.

A pep talk on politics was the nature of Bertha Adkins' speech. She pointed out that the White House, the Congress, and Government departments were being run by candidates chosen by parents of the Girls Nation delegates.

"The Government will soon be yours," she said, "and will be as good as you choose it to be."

"Your experience in Girls Nation," she continued, "has shown you the importance of political activity. You are not only responsible for electing your officials \* \* \* you are responsible for selecting them."

John Foster Dulles provided the afternoon highlights of the Girls Nation schedule yesterday. The distinguished, white-haired Secretary of State received the delegates at 2 p. m. in the second-floor auditorium of the old State Department Building where he usually holds his press conferences.

"I'm really going to enjoy this," he quipped, "not having to answer questions from the boys."

The Secretary explained that his grandfather had been Secretary of State 60 years ago, when the office was much more leisurely. As Secretary in the Eisenhower administration, however, he works 12 hours a day including many weekends, and has traveled over 150,000 miles negotiating for peace with other countries.

Russell L. Riley, Director of the International Education Exchange Service, took over at 2:30 to brief the girls on cultural ties with other lands. They also heard Miss Mary Trent, a Foreign Service officer, sketch the advantages of overseas foreign service work. Robert C. F. Gordon, a member of the State Department's policy reports staff, finished up with a chat on American interests and United States bases abroad.

While the rest of the group returned to American University, their headquarters for the week, the two Girls Nation presidential candidates were whisked to Voice of America headquarters for a special overseas broadcast.

Pat Priest, daughter of Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States, pinchhit for her mother and held an informal press conference at the Treasury for Girls Nation members in the morning. Mrs. Priest, who had planned to receive the delegates at 9 a. m., then take them on a Treasury tour, was unexpectedly called out of town.

Inauguration of President Ross, and her appointment of the Girls Nation cabinet are today's Girls Nation high points. The cabinet will be chosen at 8:15 a. m., preceding a bus trip to Arlington where the delegates will conduct a wreath-laying ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a telegram from Phil Schmid & Son.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am the only Member of Congress who is in the restaurant business. I have been in that business for over 30 years. I am a member of the Chicago Restaurant Association and the National Restaurant Association, both of which organizations oppose this legislation. The American Hotel Association is also opposed to it and in a letter I received the other day they stated that if this bill is passed they will not serve trout in any of the dining rooms of any of their hotels.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to amend section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by making it a crime, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or not more than a \$1,000 fine, or both, for a first offense, and not more than 3 years and a fine of not more than \$10,000 for a second offense, for any person to possess, in a form ready for serving, or serving at a public eating place, trout produced outside the United States unless there appears on the menu the word "trout," preceded by the name of the country of origin, or, in the absence of a menu, displaying a sign to such effect therein; or for any person to sell, offer for sale, or possess for sale as food any trout produced outside the United States unless such trout is packaged, or if in a package which is broken while held for sale, for each unit of sale to be contained in a package and for each package to be marked with the country of origin.

The proponents of the bill state that it is a measure to prevent fraud and protect the domestic industry against fraudulent practices. The agency of the Government to which has been entrusted the protection of consumers against fraudulent labeling, packaging, and sale of food products is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and particularly the Food and Drug Administration of the said agency. This section of the law in question is proposed as an amendment of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and it is therefore particularly important to note the basis of the objections to this bill which



has been made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and placed in the record of the hearing. I quote from a letter written by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency—now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to the late Senator Tobey, dated March 31, 1953, setting forth the reasons for the agency's objection to the bill:

In the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act we have investigated importations of fresh-water trout. This law requires all packages of the product to bear the word "trout." The laws enforced by the Bureau of Customs require products imported into the United States to be labeled with a statement of the country of origin. The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibits removal or alteration of required labeling while an article is held for sale, and the customs laws provide penalties for removing markings concerning the country of origin if this is done to conceal the source. It appears, therefore, that existing law already requires proper labeling of packages of fresh-water trout from abroad.

In considering the provisions of this bill with respect to the serving of foreign trout in public-eating places we should bear in mind that there are about 525,000 such places in the United States, and that enforcement of the measure would require that the practices of these places be kept under surveillance.

In our view the value to patrons of public-eating places of knowing that the trout served is of foreign origin would not justify the substantial cost of adequate regulation. We must, therefore, recommend against enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. M. R. Stephens, Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, appeared at the hearings held by the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and voiced the same objections as those contained in the letter from Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby.

No other food has been thus singled out for such treatment and a serious question arises as to the legality of a law which reaches down into the local restaurant and attempts to dictate how a particular item on its menu should be listed. Restaurants sell a great variety of food products, many of which come from all corners of the earth. If this requirement were enacted into law, then the same provision could be enacted in other laws where an imported product competes with one produced in this country. A restaurant menu would then take on a ridiculous look, with many prominent and conspicuous notices of country of origin. A menu might contain such listings as Chinese rice; Spanish onions; Canadian salmon; Cuban sugar; Brazilian coffee; Mexican shrimp, and so forth ad infinitum, and woe be unto that restaurateur who forgets to list the particular country of origin or makes an error in his listing because the penalty of up to 3 years in jail would be hanging over his head.

The separate wrapping and labeling of each individual fish which would be required by this legislation is a hardship imposed upon the foreign product whereas no such requirement would be in effect for the domestic product. The proposed bill interferes with our international relations and trade, and accord-

ingly, our State Department has opposed the legislation in question, and in a letter of April 1, 1953, written by Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary, for the Secretary of State, to the late Senator Tobey, which appears on page 53 of the record of the House committee hearing, the following observation was made:

By providing special conditions applicable only to imported and not to domestic products, this bill is inconsistent with reciprocal international commitments which this Government has obtained for the purpose of protecting the interests of American exporters in foreign markets. The United States has negotiated treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation, and other international agreements with many countries, some of which are producers of trout for export, containing provisions to the effect that products of either party shall be accorded, within the territories of the other party, national treatment in all matters affecting internal taxation, sale, distribution, storage, and use, that is, treatment of the foreign product equal in these respects to that accorded to the domestic product. The United States Government, since soon after its establishment, has sought such reciprocal commitments from other countries to assure American nationals the opportunity to engage in international trade on an equitable basis. The proposed bill would require the United States, inconsistently with such commitments, to deny national treatment to one class of imported goods. If additional requirements to indicate the origin of trout were considered desirable, such requirements could be imposed on domestically produced trout and foreign trout alike, without any departure from the established policy of the United States to accord national treatment to the goods of friendly foreign countries.

Congress certainly has a great many more important things to consider than how this relatively inconsequential product should be listed on restaurant menus and how it should be packed. It is a presumption upon the time and effort of Members of Congress to attempt to adopt such special interest legislation. The existing provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and all the various local laws and ordinances, certainly afford ample protection against the fraudulent sale of all kinds of food by distributors or in restaurants. Section 403a of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act already provides that a food shall be deemed to be misbranded if its label is false and misleading in any particular. Any foreign produced trout labeled "Rocky Mountain trout," or by any other name which would indicate a place of origin other than its actual origin, would come under the condemnation of this existing provision of the law.

There is no need for the legislation in question and it will serve only to impose a burden on our domestic industry as well as raise additional barriers to international trade and tend to further deteriorate our already precarious international trade relations.

I am opposed to this rule and it should be defeated.

AMERICAN HOTEL ASSOCIATION,  
New York, N. Y., July 28, 1954.

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: Pursuant to our conversation with you, we are authorized by our principals to tell you that the American Hotel Association believes that if S.

2033, the trout-labeling bill, should be enacted into law, as the bill now reads, the hotels of the country would be obliged to cease serving trout on their menus.

The hotels, and we would think that the same principle would apply to restaurants, simply would not dare run the risk of handling trout, imported or domestic, which might have been erroneously labeled by our suppliers, and face the extremely heavy penalties provided for any violation of the act.

We think it is also pertinent that the Food and Drug Administration continues to vigorously oppose this legislation. They complain that they never could enforce it without neglecting almost all other important activities. We understand that Mr. George Larrick, the present Commissioner, is prepared to publicly make this statement if questioned. His telephone number is Executive 3-6300, extension 3712. Or if he cannot be reached, Mr. Don Counihan is authorized to speak for him.

Respectfully,

M. O. RYAN.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. It would appear to me if trout, either foreign or domestic, have any friends around here, that the worst thing on earth you could do for the trout business is to pass a law that would make the restaurant keeper afraid to serve trout at any time. Is that not the way the restaurant people feel about it?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am sure that is the way they and I feel about it. It is just legislating these people out of business.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to hear that the State Department is against this trout bill. That is nothing unusual for the State Department. Only 4 years ago they were shipping 8 million pounds of filets into the United States, that is, salt-water filets. Four years afterward it jumped from 8 million to 120 million pounds. But they do not think that that is bad for the fishermen or the fish handlers in the United States, so they are against it. They are against anything, in my opinion, that would help the United States if some foreigner is interested in it. With them the foreigner comes first. I know that is kind of a tough thing to say.

I believe it was said there were 525,000 restaurants or hotels who sell trout. Well, I would just like to have you Members think it over for a few moments and see how many hotels or restaurants you have been in where you have seen trout listed on the menu. This proposition here today is a proposition to protect a few raisers of trout in this country.

It is unusual to find the right locality to raise trout. You have to have the water at a certain temperature; and it has to be the same all the time. It has to be spring water. The man who runs a trout farm—and it is a trout farm—strips the trout in the spring and sells the eggs to State hatcheries, to State governments, or to anybody interested in the idea of this outdoor recreation of fishing. If you want to drive these people out of business, you will not have any

trout—that is all. They are not going to ship eggs from Japan or some other place. And what is wrong, anyway, in labeling the stuff that they are selling? It is done everywhere. In Massachusetts we have laws on the books that compel people to tell what kind of product they are selling. For instance, we sell Cape Cod scallops. They have got to be Cape Cod scallops. You cannot sell these sea scallops. Of course, Members may not know anything about that, but a bay scallop in Massachusetts is one of the sweetest, tenderest things to eat that there is in the world. But a sea scallop is fishy.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that restaurants will label anything when it is to their advantage; but when they want to deceive the public, perhaps, then they object to labeling certain things when such labeling would work to the advantage of our American industry?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why, certainly. Half the menus we see in some of these grand hotels do not tell us what we are ordering, anyway; and we do not know until we ask the waiter what it means.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wanted to say briefly what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] has already said, that anyone picking up a restaurant menu will find a number of things that are labeled, such as Hawaiian pineapple, or some other product that comes from a specific place. I see no objection to this, and I do not know the reason why there should be all this objection to it on the floor.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We have listened to the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI]. I do not know whether he has a restaurant or a hotel, or what he has, but if he wants to sell trout under this bill, all he has to do is to say whether it is Japanese trout or Danish trout, and it will not hurt his business one bit. But, on the other hand, not to do it will hurt the man who is raising these trout for the benefit of the whole Nation. And they certainly are doing it.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEAMER. Is it not true that practically all manufacturers label their products? For instance, pottery makers put a stamp on the bottom of their product, manufactured in this or that country, or the product of this or that country. The same principle is applied to many food products. For instance, is it not true that restaurants serving oleomargarine must carry signs to inform the public that they are serving oleo?

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is true. All this gets back to the State Department again. There is not anything in this bill that would prohibit Japan or Norway or Denmark, or any other country, from sending in all the stuff that they want to ship in here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the "Isaac Walton" from Brooklyn talked about some kind of fish—the Gowanus Canal guppies, a species of fish found in the Gowanus Canal, evidently in his district. Apparently the gentleman's knowledge of fish other than that which he buys at a fish market is confined to that particular area of Brooklyn, the Gowanus Canal or Lavender Lake and the Hudson River; I do not believe he is too well qualified to talk about trout, the subject matter before us today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] also said that a great deal of pressure had been brought on Members of Congress with reference to this proposed legislation. From the remarks that I have heard from the Members opposing this legislation it is quite evident that the hotels and the restaurants have brought considerable pressure on Members who do not want this bill passed because it might affect their business and the customers might know what they were eating. Johnny Mock, a great conservationist back in my State of Pennsylvania, recently in his column in the Pittsburgh Press states this case better than I could, and I should like to read excerpts from his column. All Outdoors, about the need for trout-labeling legislation.

#### TROUT BUSINESS AT STAKE

"All we ask is that the other fellow be honest in his dealings."

So advised an official of the nationwide association of trout propagators—and because the other chap isn't honest, thousands of fishermen throughout the country may eventually be denied a sport now being enjoyed.

Strange as it may seem, it is the deception practiced by exporters of foreign trout, their agents and those who serve the trout to the public, which is threatening the welfare of the enterprise that supplies trout for farm ponds, fee fishing sites and privately stocked waters, thereby reducing the ever-increasing pressure on public waters. Trout for such projects are obtainable in no other way, since Federal and State hatcheries are not permitted to sell any of their production.

#### Continuing he states:

Because of a devalued currency, the foreign trout have been underselling the domestic trout. However, in the quality there is no comparison.

To overcome the superiority and prestige of the American-reared trout, the exporters mislabeled and misrepresented their product, passing them on to the restaurants and hotels as domestic trout—and the latter served the inferior product as one produced in this country.

As a result of this deception, those who have enjoyed eating trout, conscious of the poorer quality, blamed their dissatisfaction on our propagators and quit ordering what was once the most delicious portion of a delightful meal.

Now I might state to the Members, this is a trout-labeling bill, to correct these conditions and the restaurant proprietor will have to state exactly what he is serving his customers, foreign or domestic trout and that is as it should be.

I understand the shippers of trout export them to this country in refrigerated cases and package the trout in bunches of 12 or more. They label the packages

"Rocky Mountain Trout," "Montana Trout," "Idaho Trout," or use the name of whichever State is most appealing to their trade. By this deceptive method the customer is led to believe he is eating domestic trout. All this legislation does is to label them for what they are and where they came from—Japan, Denmark, or wherever these trout do come from—so that the people will know just exactly what they are buying and eating.

My good friend Johnny Mock continues:

To remedy the situation to some extent a measure known as the trout-labeling bill was introduced in Congress last year. It is not a subsidy, a tariff, nor does it restrain the importation of foreign trout. Designed to do away with the deception, it will put an end to tricking the American public and give it the opportunity to choose between the two—domestic or foreign trout.

Specifically, the bill requires exporters to have on the package the name of the country in which the trout originated and to make the eating places identify the trout on their menus in the same manner.

In short, it merely requests the other fellow to be honest in his dealings. It is far short of the protection which should be given to the American propagators—but that's all they are asking for.

The Senate version of the bill was unanimously approved at the last session of Congress.

Given a hearing in the House, it was reported out unanimously by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON's Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On the Consent Calendar it was objected to. The Rules Committee, after a hearing, gave it a rule. Thus after two hearings, the opposition to the bill failed to gain any committee support.

To stand by while the deception continues can result in only one outcome—the destruction of a medium which is absolutely necessary to the continuation of a national pastime and recreation, one which is of direct and indirect interest to the 17,652,478 individuals who purchased fishing licenses last year.

Charity begins at home. Let's put it into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this proposed legislation. It will help the domestic producers of trout protect this growing business, a protection to which he so rightfully is entitled.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. So that it may be specifically understood, I am certainly in support of this bill and I hope the House will support it overwhelmingly.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in support of this bill, just as I am.

I have before me a report from the committee, and I read there certain of the sponsors of this bill. They are the Isaac Walton League of America, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sports and Fishing Institute and many others, undoubtedly including the sporting associations and clubs in your own congressional districts. I might add that



those associations, if they are similar to the ones in my district, where they are strong, are made up principally of men who never get into the restaurants where this make-believe trout about which we are talking is served, but they are individuals who go out and work hard and then go trout fishing to enjoy the sporting life of a fisherman. They do not go to the high-priced restaurants and eat this fish in most instances, but they go out and catch the trout which live in the streams of our country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Members on both sides of the aisle have spoken to me about this bill, and I have looked into the matter as best I could and have come to the conclusion that I shall support the rule and the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I hope the House will do likewise.

These friends of yours and mine who belong to the various sporting clubs and fishing and hunting associations all over the Nation are in favor of this bill not because, I repeat, they want to go to the high-priced restaurants and pay for trout, but because they want trout fishing within your own congressional districts improved, and to get that they know there must be in this country these independent producers, these small businessmen who raise trout, and who make the trout available for propagation in the streams of your congressional districts. Your friends at home want this bill passed so that this business can be protected and so that American-grown trout will again become prevalent in your streams. That is why I am for this bill.

I am not worried about the restaurants, because very few of the 535,000 restaurants in our country serve trout, and, if they do, it is my experience that most of them are honest enough to sell what the American citizen thinks he is buying. If the American public is going to buy foreign trout, then the restaurateur will tell him so, but if they will not, if they are honest restaurant men, sell as Rocky Mountain trout something grown somewhere else.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not quite understand the language on lines 10, 11, and 12 on page 3. Will the gentleman tell me what that means?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. No, I have not translated it myself as yet. Referring to page 3, lines 10, 11, and 12, perhaps, the gentleman will tell us.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not know.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. They are the kinds of trout which are grown in this country, I presume, which we want to protect so that our children and their children can go out and catch American grown trout.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, I want to know if it includes suckers and bullheads. We have a lot of them.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It includes anything of high American quality.

If I may complete my statement, if we are to have American industry protected here and if it is worthwhile to protect that industry and protect the growth that comes to our country as a result, in finishing I would like to bring this matter to the climax, which, I think, is the important one, namely, if we are to protect this industry and make it possible for live trout to be available for propagation in the trout streams of our country under the guidance of the local fish and game associations, we can best do it by supporting this legislation which will permit the American industry to increase in size, improve its production and, thus, increase trout fishing throughout the streams of our country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 90, noes 86.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and Mr. MADDEN.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 107, noes 84.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I thought there was a similar objection prior to the vote and that the Speaker counted a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair inquires of the majority leader if he wants to put the vote over. A sufficient number have demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have just discussed the matter with the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and he tells me that he had an agreement with some of the Tennessee Members that if there was to be a record vote today it would be put off until a later date in view of the fact that the Tennessee primaries are being held today. In view of that statement of the minority leader, I have no alternative except to ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the bill now under consideration be postponed until Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a measure is to be called under discharge petition on Monday, will the vote on the pending matter be the unfinished business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that the roll call on this rule will follow action on the discharge petition.

#### APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 698) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That ELIZABETH PRUETT FARRINGTON, the Delegate from Hawaii, be, and she is hereby, elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DIRECT HOME AND FARMHOUSE LOAN AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8152) to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Messrs. KEARNEY, AYRES, TEAGUE, and DORN of South Carolina.

#### AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the bill H. R. 9757 may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### UNITED STATES BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress who have worked hard over the years to build up the excellent United States Bureau of Mines, including its remarkably successful mine safety program, were simply flabbergasted last week by a report issued by the Department of Interior, parent organization of the Mines Bureau.

It was one of the most cold-blooded "get Government out of business" hair documents I have seen in a long time, even though this administration seems to be working overtime at ridding the Government of functions which help all of the people.

In brief, the suggestions made by a survey team appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and approvingly endorsed by him include:

First. Pulling the teeth of the mine safety law by redirecting its purpose from that of policing unsafe mines to education in mine safety. When the Mines Bureau had only the power to educate and recommend, fatalities soared. Since it has had the power to close unsafe mines, and require compliance, fatalities have dropped to zero.

Second. Eliminating much of the Mines Bureau's research work in the conversion of coal to synthetic liquid fuels, while at the same time expanding the Bureau's work in the search for new petroleum reserves this looks strictly like oil industry propaganda to kill off coal-to-oil research.

Third. Getting rid of the Government's helium, zirconium, and titanium research and development operations. These materials, so vital to national defense, would never have been developed as they have been if the Government had not undertaken the heavy expense of the research work. Now the whole business is to be turned over to possible private monopolies which could place the Government at their mercy.

#### SABOTAGING THE MINE-SAFETY PROGRAM

To us in the coal areas, the most important and most shocking of these recommendations is the one to throw the mine-safety program back into the shape it was in prior to the passage of the new law in the 81st Congress—the one which gave the Federal inspectors the right to enforce their recommendations. As chairman of the House Labor Subcommittee which handled this legislation, I lived through the terrific fight which preceded its passage and heard over and over again all the old arguments advanced to block the bill which are now trotted out to seek to destroy its effectiveness.

The survey team, composed of a college professor, a copper company official, a coal corporation executive, a leading oil man, and an industrial materials expert, even went so far as to recommend that the United States inspectors give a mine a day's advance notice before showing up to make an inspection. The

reason it gave for that tipoff suggestion was as follows:

This procedure would save the time of the inspectors, the mine-safety committee, and the mine management. When an inspector arrives unannounced, after a shift starts, time is wasted in getting together the proper people for the inspection.

What about the lives which would be wasted if these inspections came only after a day's coverup warning? This suggestion was so extreme, the Department of Interior said it would reserve judgment on that one.

But it is seeking to put into effect others to consolidate the whole eastern part of the United States, with its wide variety of diverse Mines Bureau problems, into a single region; to close down oil shale research and drastically reduce work on coal gasification or liquefaction; to drop helium, zirconium, and titanium operations, and so on.

#### LIKE TURNING SEC OVER TO THE STOCK MARKET

It struck me that this report was as fantastic as if the Securities and Exchange Commission were to suggest turning over to the States or to the stock exchange the policing of the laws on honesty in securities; as if the Civil Aeronautics Board were to let the States or even the airlines regulate commercial aviation; as if the Interstate Commerce Commission were to let the States or even the railroads handle all railroad safety enforcement.

Under the mine-safety program, lives have been saved that would otherwise have been lost. We cannot ridicule that kind of record.

#### JOBLESS MILLIONS AND FAMILIES IGNORED IN GOP RUSH TO ADJOURN

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to ask if the Eisenhower administration intends to adjourn this Congress without doing something about the Nation's serious economic situation. There are many areas in all parts of the country where there is considerable suffering and distress because of enforced idleness of many thousands of working people. My district is especially hard hit.

How can the Republican leadership continue to ignore the plight of these people, or to say that it is not a serious matter?

Several days ago I was shocked by the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by one of our Republican colleagues from Ohio. It pooh-poohed recession talk and pointed to the record profits of General Motors and other giant corporations for the first 6 months of 1954. But people in my district do not accept the administration philosophy. They do not believe that what is good for General Motors is necessarily good for the Nation. In fact, a General Motors contract caused very

serious unemployment and distress in my district when a tank contract was shifted to GM.

The prosperity now being enjoyed by big monopolies is of little comfort to the millions of workers and their families who must live on inadequate unemployment insurance benefits. It means much less to those whose unemployment insurance checks are running out.

Tax advantages voted by this administration to monopoly interests have permitted increased profits to empires like du Pont, General Electric, and General Motors, despite reduced sales. Yet the Eisenhower leadership has refused to make adequate improvements in unemployment insurance benefits, or to aid the average citizen with tax relief or a public works program.

The rush by this administration to give to the special interests natural resources, tax advantages, public lands, and the people's investment in atomic secrets is a sorry contrast to its do-nothing policy on issues involving the health, prosperity, and welfare of the people.

Let us have some action before we quit.

#### TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 690 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or Committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 690, which will make in order the consideration of the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

House Resolution 690 provides for an open rule, waiving points of order with 1 hour of general debate. The rule



would also provide for the consideration of the committee substitute amendment as an original bill for purposes of amendment. A separate vote may be demanded on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. One motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the President to turn over certain property to organizations designated by the President to be used for the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of persecuted persons. The property involved in this bill was property owned by persecuted persons who died without heirs.

A limit of \$3 million would be established by this bill regarding the total value of the property which may be turned over to these organizations.

According to the report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, efforts in this general direction have been going on for several years.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved of the objectives outlined in this bill and it has the approval of the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, since this rule is an open one and therefore open to amendment I can see no valid objection to the House adopting the rule. I hope that the House adopts the rule so that we may proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2420, with Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in 1946, an amendment was enacted to the Trading With the Enemy Act, which provided that the property which was vested in the Alien Property Custodian that had belonged to persons who either were persecuted or killed by the enemy forces during World War II should be returned to those persons if they were alive and to their heirs if they had died. The United States, therefore, has declared in effect that this property does not belong to the United States. This bill in effect would provide that the President of the United States should designate certain organizations to act as the heirs to that property, and provide for the disposition of the funds. There is a limit placed upon the amount of property which may be so turned over. That limit is \$3 million. Through amendments to the bill we have

provided that the funds would have to be expended in the United States and upon destitute persons.

Mr. Chairman, a similar bill was passed by the Senate in the 80th Congress as S. 2764; in the 81st Congress as S. 603; in the 82d Congress it was reported to the Senate but was not acted upon prior to adjournment. It was reported previously by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but it was not acted upon prior to adjournment.

At this time we hope that this bill S. 2420 may be finally enacted by both Houses and become law. The bill was not heard by the committee in this session of Congress because it had been heard before. There were ample hearings held in both the House and the Senate. It is merely a matter of policy to be decided in the Congress.

I believe the bill should be adopted with the amendments offered by the committee. I may state to the House that these amendments were offered by virtue of the committee first having ordered reported the bill and a minority report having been filed. Before the bill was actually filed in the House as reported it was sought to remedy these defects, those which were considered to be such defects by the minority. It was thought that the minority would be pleased with the amendments and that the bill would be acceptable to them. However, there still seems to be some objection to the bill although it was passed out of our committee by a very, very substantial majority vote and the minority opposed was greatly reduced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to join myself with the remarks the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has made. I think this is a fair bill, one that has been very carefully studied and with the amendments adopted it certainly ought to justify a great majority of the Members of the House voting for it. It is a bill that aims to bring justice to a certain group of persons. It should be enacted into law.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished former majority leader and present whip.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a great deal that I can add to what the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has said about this bill except perhaps to highlight some of the facts behind it.

First as to the objections of the minority which are set forth in the minority report. They are based mainly on the fact that the committee has not given sufficient time or study to the problem. As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] pointed out, this bill was passed by the appropriate Senate committee on three different occasions; passed unanimously by the Senate on 2 occasions, but on 1 occasion the Senate could not get to it before adjournment. It was also reported out by the House

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As a member of the War Claims Subcommittee of that committee, of which the gentleman from California is the chairman, I may say that that committee unanimously reported out this legislation.

The principle involved, which is the important thing, is something that I believe we all know about, and with which a great majority of us agree. Certainly the bill itself has been given a good deal of study over the past number of years, both in this House and in the other body.

As you all know, I am sure, the Trading-with-the-Enemy Act provided that funds or property in this country of enemy aliens should be vested in the Alien Property Custodian. Many of the people who have been in this country were persecutees, namely, Jews who were persecuted by the Hitler regime of Germany and who came to this country to escape that persecution. Where possible, they brought their property, their money, with them. When war was declared they were enemy aliens because they were German and, therefore, their property was confiscated. The Attorney General and the Alien Property Custodian obviously could see that the law was never intended to apply to those people. They were not enemies of this country, they were enemies of the Hitler regime. They were enemies of our enemies. To help them, an amendment was passed that in such cases their money and property could be returned to them.

What is the purpose of this bill, you may say, if we have such a law—and do. Many of these people whose property was taken from them, persecutees, as I shall call them, died during the pendency of these proceedings and, therefore, cannot ask to get their money or property back. In the normal case their heirs would be entitled to it. It is no secret, everybody knows what happened to the Jewish population in Germany. Entire families, 6 million Jews, as you know, were wiped out by Hitler. Therefore, this legislation is intended to cover those people who have no heirs. Their families have been wiped out. There is nobody to ask for that money. It is being held by the Alien Property Custodian. The administration says it should be turned over.

Incidentally, may I point out that the military government law in Germany today, which was administered by General Clay, has a similar law which states that such money should be turned over to an organization which will use it for the benefit of persecutees of similar religions or similar political groups, which is all we are trying to do here. The organization which was set up at that time in Germany by the administration, and approved by General Clay, is a similar organization; in fact, the same organization as I believe will be selected by the President. But in this case this legislation says that such organization, or successor organization, shall be approved by the President and under certain safeguards will take that money or property and distribute it among persecutees but not the direct heirs of the

people from whom the money had originally been taken.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I say to the gentleman and the Members of the House that the husband of my secretary was hired by the United States Military Government of Germany to go over to Germany and appraise the gold and jewelry which had been found in places like Buchenwald and elsewhere. That gentleman upon arriving there for his duty found large milk cans and ammunition cans filled with such things as gold teeth and inexpensive jewelry of all kinds and descriptions, and some of value, which the Germans had very carefully saved after destroying the bodies of their victims. It was a most awful sight and a horrible experience to go through. It is quite true that 6 million died at their hands and that so-called genocide was practiced in a very large way.

That property was turned over, as I understand, with such value as it had, for liquidation to apply to the resettlement of the survivors in other countries and for their transportation, and so on. It was a humane thing to do, one in which the United States participated as a military government. It is worthy of the United States to participate again in this disposition of property for which there are no heirs and no claimants.

The United States does not claim the property and no heirs claim the property.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I will say before he says anything, that I respect the gentleman and have served with him a long time and have the highest regard for him. His opposition to this bill, I am certain, is an opposition which he feels as a matter of principle.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for his statement and he has stated my position. The property which the gentleman from California talks about, of course, has nothing to do with the property that is involved here.

Mr. KLEIN. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The property that is involved here is property which is owned by those people who have disappeared, and it is claimed have no known heirs and the property is located in this country. Is that correct?

Mr. KLEIN. That is correct, yes, sir.

In an endeavor, as the gentleman from California pointed out, to get this very, very worthwhile legislation out, and this is legislation which almost everybody favors, including the executive department, the President, the administration, when I learned there were certain members of our committee opposed to it and proposed to sign the minority report—I went to them and asked them what the objections were. In an endeavor to get this out by unanimous consent and get it passed by unanimous consent, I introduced in the committee four

amendments which would take care of—at least I thought they would—all the objections. Let me point out just what they are. We will have an opportunity to vote on them in a few minutes. The bill was passed by the Senate and came over amended in these four instances so as to take care of the objections of some of the minority. Some of them were satisfied and some of them were not. The objections that were made were—first, that the money that was taken from the Alien Property Custodian, this heirless property, and given to the successor organization to dispose of, might be distributed by that organization to anybody who would apply and not to somebody who actually needed the money. Therefore, we wrote into the law and into the amendments an actual needs test. In other words, before a person could qualify to get any part of this money, he would have to show among other things, which I will come to in a minute, that he was actually in need and needed the money—that he had been on relief and things of that kind. That was one of the amendments.

The next objection was that some of the members of the minority felt that much, or a part of this, money might go for administrative expenses or for legal fees for lawyers representing the claimants. In order to dispose of that objection, we wrote into this legislation an amendment that no part of these funds could be used for legal fees or administrative expenses at all. This means that some of the associations and some of the charitable organizations interested in this type of legislation have agreed to pay out of their pockets, or prominent wealthy people will agree to pay the money out of their pockets, any legal fees or any administrative expenses, so that no part of this fund will be diminished by that type of expense.

The third objection was that a new organization might be set up, then for that purpose, and even though the President must approve of the organization, that it might be a fly-by-night organization. Therefore, we wrote into the law another amendment which says that the organization, in order to be eligible to be appointed, must have been in existence as of January 1, 1950. We went back that much so that it must be, and will be, a well established organization. As a matter of fact, it is contemplated it will be, as pointed out, the same organization appointed by General Clay in Germany under Military Government Law No. 59, which is almost identical with this for distribution.

The last and the fourth amendment, which we introduced and which was adopted in the committee, was to the effect that money which was obtained might be used for just a particular religion or a particular class of persons. Actually, in all fairness, and I do not think it is any secret since the hearings before the subcommittee brought it out, over 90 percent of those funds were funds from Jews. However, in order to avoid any possibility of the bill not passing, we agreed to an amendment which provides that the people must be actual persecutees. They must be in need, and they can be of any religion. They do not have

to be of the same religion, they do not have to be of the same political class as the law reads in the military-government law.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. As I understand the bill, the purpose of these funds is for the relocation and rehabilitation of persons who are in this country. I presume they have come to this country, either in some capacity or other, by reason of persecution and are displaced persons.

Now, can the gentleman tell me after a lapse of 9 years, how many persons are in the category that would be entitled to such moneys from this organization?

Mr. KLEIN. I cannot tell you how many, but I can tell you the approximate amount. It will probably be less than a million; it will be probably between \$500,000 and \$1 million.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. No. The gentleman did not understand me. I have reference to the number of persons for which this money could be used.

Mr. KLEIN. I cannot give the gentleman that figure.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The largest population of Hitler's persecutees is in my district. There are not less than 25,000 families in my district who have that kind of origin. It is my belief that a material portion of those families contain old and indigent people who will actually qualify under this law. I shall have an opportunity later to explain that.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman, and I believe he has answered the question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say in connection with the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that there are a great number of persecutees in my district. I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. A great number of these unfortunate people are struggling to become established and this legislation would be a great aid for them.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] made a statement as to what happened to the Jews in Germany at the time of Hitler's rampage. I was in Europe a month ago with the Committee Investigating Communist Aggression which this Congress created. I had an opportunity to go through Dachau. Dachau will be one of the exhibits which will forever reveal the barbarism and criminal minds of Hitler and his cohorts. That deplorable period will rank with the barbarism, atrocities, and murders committed by Stalin and his henchmen. I think this legislation is necessary legislation. This property does not belong to the Government. It does not belong to anybody outside of the descendants of, and should be used for the welfare of, the people who were persecutees. A great number of them are living in this country in destitution. This legislation



is not only necessary legislation but it is humane legislation. It is charitable legislation.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] and the members of this great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I understand it has passed the Senate unanimously, and it should be passed here.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman. Since the gentleman has mentioned the fact that this money does not belong to our Government, we have made it very clear that this is the policy, that this is not money belonging to the Government. On August 8, 1946—and I remember that date perfectly, because that is my birthday—we passed an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, which provided that types of people such as this or their heirs should be able to apply to get it back. Let me read one significant sentence in the majority report:

This amendment established a clear-cut distinction between the property of those persons who were in fact our enemies during the last war, and those who, as evidenced by their extreme persecution at the hands of their governments, were in fact the enemies of our enemies. It was thus made clear that the intention of the United States was not to profit from the assets of the latter class of individuals.

So, Mr. Chairman, this bill would simply be an act of decent justice.

The Government does not want this money; the Government is not entitled to it. What are we to do with it?

Since we cannot return it to the people who originally owned it, I think the fairest and best thing to do is to use it to alleviate as best we may the unfortunate circumstances of those we have heard about today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill which, together with its predecessors, has had quite a history.

In speaking on this bill I do not want to be at all misunderstood. I have not the slightest bit of religious intolerance in my being, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], my good friend, recognized when he said he knew it was a matter of principle with me that I have always opposed this legislation. That is entirely correct. I have told him that and I have told him and others who have likewise been interested in this legislation that I would feel the same way whether it was any other race or any other religion involved, and I have not the slightest desire to imply that I am opposed to it because of the type of legislation it is.

I took the position on this bill—and it has a strange history. It is true it passed the Senate three times. I do not know whether they ever held hearings of any kind; I do not know whether it was ever debated at any time. I doubt it. The last time we had this legislation before our Committee on Interstate and

Foreign Commerce was 4 years ago. It is true our committee held hearings. It is true the committee reported out a bill, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] and I filed objections, or at least we appeared before the Rules Committee in objection to the granting of a rule, and a rule was denied; it was never granted by the Rules Committee.

This time, 4 years later, the bill was reported out without further hearings of any kind.

I objected to it when it was reported out, but the committee reported it out anyway because the majority of the committee was for it. Some other members of our committee filed minority views, and the bill was recalled by the committee, then rewritten, as the gentleman from New York said, with these four amendments covering objections that were raised by the minority views. Then the bill was reported out again.

I was never afforded—nor were my other colleagues who were opposed to the bill and who are absent today and not able to be here—were never notified of any hearings before the Rules Committee, so we had no opportunity to appear before the Rules Committee.

I want to make my position absolutely clear. I just do not understand where there is any justification whatsoever for this legislation. There is nothing that I can conceive of that was more inhuman than the treatment of the Jewish people by Hitler. On the other hand, there were many thousands of other people who got the same kind of treatment from Austria, particularly from Poland, from people out of Germany who were opposed, both Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, people who were liquidated.

It is claimed in this legislation that there is property in this country belonging to some of those people. This legislation is so worded that it applies and will apply to the people of the Jewish faith and of the same political and racial views. I believe it is unquestioned that at least 90 percent, if not more, of this property that is involved would go to the people of the Jewish faith. The bill as it is drawn would turn to the limit of \$3 million of this property over to these 2 Jewish organizations. Originally the bill was so open it could have been possible to create ad hoc committees to which it could have gone. I make no complaint about these two Jewish organizations because they have done great work over the years in the matter of help to their own people. But this money, as I take it, and they say, it does not belong to the United States but I say it will escheat to the United States so that when we take the view that it is not property belonging to the Government of the United States, literally that may be true at the present moment but it is property which could and should well become the property of the United States and under the theory of escheat to the United States where there are no lawful heirs.

It is claimed they cannot find the heirs of these people who are the owners of this property. I suppose they have been liquidated or they have been scattered. At least it is claimed that they have not been located. But I never heard of the theory of attaching a law-

ful right of ownership to somebody because they were of the same race or religion or political belief and that they were likewise persecuted.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. I just want to say to the gentleman that I knew that was his objection and that is why we amended the legislation so it does not provide for application to any particular race or religion.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course, under the legislation as amended, as the gentleman stated, it will enure to the benefit of these 2 Jewish organizations to the extent of at least 90 percent.

Mr. KLEIN. I did not say that. I said 90 percent of the people whose money this is were Jews, but actually we have amended the proposed bill so that it does not apply to any particular group.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I think the gentleman and I agree it does mean 90 percent of this would, under the bill as amended, go to persons who would be of the Jewish faith.

Mr. KLEIN. There is no secret as to how I feel on that. Certainly they are the ones who ought to get it because it was their money; but in order to get this legislation through I was willing to offer that amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Anyway, there is no question but what that is the issue. I take the position that regardless of what race it might be or what religion it might be, I cannot pursue and follow out the thinking of the majority of my committee in this regard. While there is a minority who agree with me on the committee, personally I can see no moral or consistent reason or justification for the passage of this type of legislation without hearings to bring us up to date.

I addressed an inquiry to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] which the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said he would speak on. We had no testimony before the committee either at the previous hearing 4 years ago or at the present time as to how many of these people who were persecutees, so to speak, were in this country and in need of assistance. There is not a particle of information on that.

Therefore I feel it would be well for this bill to be recommitted and I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further consideration.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS.]

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that property in the United States which has been or may in the future be vested and which is heirless or unclaimed shall be used, through designated successor organizations, for the relief of surviving persecutees or their dependents. It requires, in the House version, that the expenditure of the funds made thus available be for the benefit of needy persons. It thus recognizes a principle which has been a basic element in American foreign policy for many years.

From the beginning of its occupation responsibilities in Germany, the United States has shown itself solicitous of the rights and the needs of surviving persecutees. It has long ago taken legislative steps to insure that the property of persecutees—religious, racial, or political—in the United States shall be returned to those persons who were regarded by the Nazis as their first enemies. The United States has repeatedly urged, as a matter of foreign policy, that measures be enacted to make heirless property available for relief of persons who were persecuted, who are in need, and who have lost their health, their property, and their livelihoods as a result of the same type of persecution under which heirless property came into existence.

Enactment of this measure will thus reinforce the foreign policy of the United States. It will underline our continued interest in the relief of the surviving persecutees, and the establishment of remedial measures where these still remain to be taken.

Much still remains to be done, for example, in Austria, where negotiations toward this end have been under way for more than a year, and where the principles recognized by the Austrian Government are still far from completely implemented—particularly as concerns heirless property. It is understood, also, that work on the problem is being done in certain neutral countries, but has not been completed. Enactment of S. 2420 will emphasize the moral basis upon which the foreign policy of the United States must and does rest.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with an extraordinary situation, and extraordinary situations call for extraordinary remedies. This is a technique which we have in this bill which has been utilized in connection with very much larger amounts of property which were found in Germany. In addition to that, as everyone knows, the German Government has worked out certain reparations or what might be called reparations to the tune of \$700 million, some parts of which also go to relief and rehabilitation. But—and here is the big but—here is the reason for the great desirability of this bill, the utilization of these funds will be in the United States where—and I would like to urge this to the House as a fact—they are urgently needed. Let me give you some proof of that. There is an organization—and I am getting the papers from my office and I will fill in the name of the organization and the address and the fellow who heads it in the RECORD—there is an organization which has been fighting very hard for justice in this matter in bringing to me case after case after case of Nazi persecutees, older people, little people on pensions, little people whose bodies and souls were broken by the Nazis, either directly because they were in concentration camps or because they lost everything in the world, not in terms of money alone but also their families and kith and kin, and these people are too proud and from their origin and background are not the kind of people to go on relief. To them this bill is a godsend, particularly for that purpose, and in my opinion the most vital amend-

ment put into this bill, which absolutely commends it to the House, is the provision that this money shall be spent in the United States. I do not think, for me, certainly, you need an emotional appeal upon this particular subject. I think I bespeak the views of every Member when I say that we would welcome, I think all of us regardless of faith, any means to express the type of feeling or sympathy which is in our hearts for this tremendous holocaust which has overtaken the Jewish people in connection with the Hitler persecution. I would like to say, I think, what the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] said about the reservation of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] was a futile thing, and I know the gentleman well enough and I would like to join with him in that tribute to him. It represents a certain amount of dedication and courage to oppose a bill of this kind, and I pay you tribute for proceeding as you did.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I pay tribute to the members of the Jewish faith. They have been my doctors and many others are my close personal friends. But, speaking of these unfortunate people, of course, there are many other people in this country who were persecutees of Hitler who are not members of the Jewish faith, such as the Germans, both Catholic and Protestant, and also a great many Polish people, who fled and finally have gotten over into this country. I have them in my own area, but they get no consideration under this type of legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand, one of the amendments that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] sponsored would see that there is consideration regardless of faith background, and I would like to say to the gentleman that to the utmost limit of my power I have always and I pledge myself now to see that this fund is used regardless of faith for those who have been hurt, and I did that at great sacrifice in connection with the problems in Europe, and I fully intend to do it in this country.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] said something about the fact that this was something new, that we were trying to do. I want to read another portion of the majority report on page 3.

The legislation is also in line with certain international commitments of the United States. On numerous occasions, the United States, together with the allied governments, has taken the position that the heirless assets of persecuted persons should be used for rehabilitation and resettlement of surviving persecutees. For example, the inter-allied agreement embodied in the final act of the Paris Conference on Reparations, December 1945, specifically provided that heirless assets found in neutral countries should be used for this same purpose. A specific program for carrying out this recommendation was embodied in the Five-Power Agreement of June 1946.

In other words, this is something that has been done before. We have it in the military government.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say that that refers, of course, to the resettlement agreements which immediately followed the war and were administered in Europe, not in this country. France and England and all of the other countries entered into the administration of it.

Mr. KLEIN. That is true. But the principle of using funds of that kind for the rehabilitation of persecuted persons is not new. The only thing new that we are doing in this country, that we have not done before, is that we waited all this time for the heirs of these people to ask for this money but obviously, they are dead and there is nobody to ask for it, which is the reason why we ask for this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say that after long and careful consideration the committee reported this bill recognizing that in this particular instance, as a matter of policy, justice was being done. What I wanted to point out, which I believe has some bearing on the matter, is included in the committee report on page 3. I do this because of its importance. This establishes a very clear policy and expresses the difference between this and some other proposals that have to do with amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act. The committee report says this:

This amendment established a clear-cut distinction between the property of those persons who were in fact our enemies during the last war, and those who, as evidenced by their extreme persecution at the hands of their governments, were in fact the enemies of our enemies.

That is precisely the difference between this kind of legislation that we have before us and other proposals that we have had affecting various war claims. I wanted to state that in support of this legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, some months ago on the floor of the House, I called to the attention of the Congress the fact that a moving picture was being filmed at Silver City, N. Mex. The fact of its production was not in itself of any great general interest, but the composition of its backers and principals was a matter of considerable significance to those who have labored in the battle against Communist aggression and Communist propaganda activities. The picture, which was to become a center of international controversy, was titled "Salt of the Earth," and purported to tell the story of minority-group miners and their families; their relationships with their employers and each other. In subsequent reviews, Salt of the Earth



has been variously described as "delightful," "a moving love story," "a triumph of artistic beauty," "moving and dramatic," and "terrific." Other national publications have called the picture Red propaganda.

When I made my speech on the floor of the House, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out that no picture made by or participated in by fifth-amendment witnesses could conceivably be designed to further the best interests of the United States of America. In spite of the favorable reviews received by the picture in some American newspapers, the fact remains that the picture was produced in large part by those who have refused before congressional committees to state whether or not they are now members of the Communist Party.

When I made my speech on the floor of the House I said that the moving-picture production being filmed at Silver City, N. Mex., would prove to be, in fact, a new weapon for the Soviet Union. At that time and for many months thereafter I was belabored by the Communist press, fellow-traveling journalists, the artistic and scientific muttonheads who should be equipped with seeing-eye dogs, and an odd assortment of individuals who defy compartmentation. I was accused of attempting to impose "censorship" on the visual arts. This, in spite of the fact that the production, *Salt of the Earth*, was widely condemned throughout the moving-picture industry by producers and union leaders alike. The people who make moving pictures know well the power and the propaganda impact that can be carried on film, and in the earliest stages of discussions which were later to lead to the production of *Salt of the Earth*, farsighted men in the moving-picture industry anticipated exactly what has since transpired.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I charge that *Salt of the Earth* and other propaganda pictures of like ilk are new weapons for the Soviet Union. The People's Daily World has just reported that the picture has been awarded highest honors in the International Film Festival held in Prague, Czechoslovakia. The report of the Red kudos is as follows:

**SALT OF EARTH, REVUELTAS, WIN TOP PRIZES IN PRAGUE INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL**  
(Special to the Daily People's World)

**PRAGUE.**—The independently made United States movie *Salt of the Earth* shared the grand prize with the Soviet film *Faithful Friends* in the Eighth International Film Festival just ended in Karlovy Vary (the former Carlsbad Spa) in Czechoslovakia.

Rosaura Revueltas, Mexican star of *Salt*, won the award for the best acting performance by a woman.

The citation to the American movie said: "It is a work of great artistic and ideological value."

*Faithful Friends* is Soviet humor at its best.

The countries represented in the film festival competitions included Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Great Britain, Holland, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America.

The prizes were awarded by an international jury headed by A. M. Brousil, rector of the Academy of the Dramatic Arts and Music in Prague.

The festival opened on July 11 and ended on July 24. The prizes were announced on July 25. There was a moving moment during the presentation of the grand prize when V. Meruriyev, who played the lead in *Faithful Friends* fervently embraced Miss Revueltas, after handing the principal festival prize to her.

The actress stopped over in Czechoslovakia on the way back from a visit to the Soviet Union. She saw the completed version of *Salt* for the first time in Moscow. Miss Revueltas, it will be recalled, was arrested by United States immigration officers on a manufactured charge and deported to Mexico while the movie was still in production in Silver City, N. Mex.

*Salt of the Earth* was a big hit at the Karlovy Vary film festival. It is now making the rounds of people's film festivals in Czechoslovakia.

Soviet and satellite film honors are not being bestowed these days on any film production which does not further enhance and glorify the Soviet system or seek to forward its purposes of economic and political aggression. It is interesting to note that the Soviet film, *Faithful Friends*, shared the top honors with *Salt of the Earth*. The faithful friends of the Soviet Union in Hollywood have been faithful indeed.

It is quite likely that the "moving love story" will net the producers a substantial profit on their investment. It is quite likely that additional productions will be forthcoming from the same source. I shall continue in my efforts to keep the Congress and the American people informed as to the activities of those "faithful friends" whose work wins such high approval behind the Iron Curtain.

It is assumed that Rosaura Revueltas, the Mexican actress who created such a furor when her deportation from the United States was ordered, had an enjoyable and productive visit in the Kremlin. Her protestations of innocence with respect to her alleged sympathy for the Communist conspiracy can now be evaluated for what they were worth at the time they were uttered.

*Salt of the Earth* is doing the job it was designed to do. It is carrying distortion, inaccuracy, and American-made Red propaganda to millions of human beings who are apt to accept this vehicle of hatred and bitterness as a true expression of life in the United States.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few of the remaining seconds that I have to commend the members of the subcommittee for bringing this bill out. I understand that it passed the other body on three separate occasions, but has always been buried in the final logjam that confronts us at the end of every session. I think the bill is a fine bill and will go a long way toward restoring much of the prestige of the United States in Europe that has been lost over the past few years. I know that now when it has passed the other body, there will be no difficulty in

getting it passed in the House and to the White House where the President has already signified his approval of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will now read the substitute amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(h) The President may designate one or more organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons who, if alive, would be eligible to receive returns under the provisions of subdivision (C) or (D) of subsection (a) (2) thereof. An organization so designated shall be deemed a successor in interest by operation of law for the purpose of subsection (a) (1) hereof. Return may be made, to an organization so designated, (a) before the expiration of 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in question, if the President or such officer or agency as he may designate determines from all relevant facts of which he is then advised that there is no basis for reasonable doubt that the former owner is dead and is survived by no person eligible under section 32 to claim as successor in interest by inheritance, devise, or bequest; and (b) after the expiration of such time, if no claim for the return of the property or interest is pending. Total returns pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed \$3 million.

"No return may be made to an organization so designated unless it files notice of claim before the expiration of 1 year from the effective date of this act and unless it gives firm and responsible assurance approved by the President that (i) the property or interest returned to it or the proceeds of any such property or interest will be used on the basis of need in the rehabilitation and settlement of persons in the United States who suffered substantial deprivation of liberty or failed to enjoy the full rights of citizenship within the meaning of subdivisions (C) and (D) of subsection (a) (2) hereof; (ii) it will transfer, at any time within 2 years from the time that return is made, such property or interest or the equivalent value thereof to any person whom the President or such officer or agency shall determine to be eligible under section 32 to claim as owner or successor in interest to such owner, by inheritance, devise, or bequest; (iii) it will make to the President, with a copy to be furnished to the Congress, such reports (including a detailed annual report on the use of the property or interest returned to it or the proceeds of any such property or interest) and permit such examination of its books as the President or such officer or agency may from time to time require; and (iv) will not use such property or interest or the proceeds of such property or interest for legal fees, salaries, or any other administrative expenses connected with the filing of claims for or the recovery of such property or interest.

"The filing of notice of claim by an organization so designated shall not bar the payment of debt claims under section 34 of this act.

"As used in this subsection, 'organization' means only a nonprofit charitable corporation incorporated on or before January 1, 1950, under the laws of any State of the United States or of the District of Columbia with the power to sue and be sued."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is here-

by amended by striking out the period at the end of such sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that return may be made to successor organizations designated pursuant to section 32 (h) hereof if notice of claim is filed before the expiration of 1 year from the effective date of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 690, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill S. 2420 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota) there were—ayes 18, noes 37.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the passage of this bill be postponed until Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I withdraw the point of order of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

#### INTERNAL REVENUE ACT, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution

(H. Con. Res. 268) relating to the enrollment of H. R. 8300.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, is authorized and directed—

(1) In section 116 (a), to strike out "to the extent" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "from domestic corporations, to the extent."

(2) In the last sentence of section 404 (d), to strike out "applies is" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "applies, is."

(3) In section 556 (b) (6), to strike out "403" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "404."

(4) In the table of sections immediately preceding section 641, to insert after "subparts" the following: "A."

(5) At the end of section 691 (b) (2), to strike out "received—" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "received."

(6) In section 804 (a) (3), to strike out subparagraph (B) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) the reserve earnings rate, bears to a denominator comprised of the aggregate of the excess of taxable incomes (computed without any deduction for tax-free interest, partially tax-exempt interest, or dividends received) over the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 806."

(7) In section 853 (e) (2), to strike out "sections" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "section."

(8) In section 1033 (b), to strike out "of residence," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of the residence."

(9) In section 2513 (b) (2) (A) and in section 2513 (c) (1), to strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "April."

(10) To add at the end of the table of sections immediately preceding section 4341 the following "Sec. 4345. Cross references."

(11) To strike out section 4551 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Sec. 4551. Imposition of tax."

"In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there is hereby imposed upon the following articles imported into the United States, unless treaty provisions of the United States otherwise provide, a tax at the rates specified. For the purposes of such tax, the term 'United States' includes Puerto Rico.

"(1) In General: Lumber, rough or planed or dressed on one or more sides, except flooring made of maple (other than Japanese maple), birch, or beech, \$3 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(2) Wood dowels: "(A) Dowels made of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock, larch, or cedar (except cedar commercially known as Spanish cedar), 75 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(B) Dowels made of Japanese maple, Japanese white oak, teak, box, ebony, lancewood, or lignum vitae, \$3 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

"(C) Dowels made of wood and for which no rate of tax is specified under subparagraph (A) or (B), \$1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure."

(12) In section 4601 (2), to strike out "duty," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "duty; and."

(13) In section 4601, to strike out paragraphs (3) and (4).

(14) In section 4601 (5), to strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(3)."

(15) In section 4602, to add at the end thereof the following:

"Each reference to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in any agreement entered into, or in any proclamation

of the President made, under the authority of such section shall be deemed also to refer to the corresponding provision of this title."

(16) In section 4773, to strike out "4732 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "4732 (b)."

(17) In section 4883 (c), to strike out "4884 (a) (4)," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "4884 (a) (3)."

(18) In section 5044, to strike out "of his delegate" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or his delegate."

(19) In section 7601 (b), to strike out "7211" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "7212."

(20) In the table of subparts preceding section 351, to strike out "Special rules" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Special rule."

(21) In section 2031 (a), to strike out "by determined" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be determined."

(22) In section 2038 (a) (2), to strike out "of where" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or where."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill S. 2420.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to join with many of my colleagues in supporting the amendment of the Trading With the Enemy Act, S. 2420.

This bill has for its purpose the disposition of property which belonged to men and women persecuted by our enemies during World War II. The rightful owners of this property are unknown; either they have been killed, leaving no heirs, or the property is not in such condition as to be recognized as belonging to anyone in particular. At the present time, it is in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

We in this body feel that the United States Government has no lawful claim to this property. Since it is impossible to return it to its owners, we are proposing, under this legislation, to arrange for it to be turned over to certain organizations which would use it for the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of persecuted people.

Similar bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House several times in the past few years. However, at no time was one of these bills passed by both Houses of Congress. S. 2420 has been passed by the Senate and, if it is passed here, will go to the President to be signed into law.

It is fitting that the assets of these persecuted people be distributed among those who suffered in like measure the atrocities and tortures of war. Approximately 90 percent of the owners of the property in question were Jewish. We feel that if they were living it would please them greatly to know that the property is to be disposed of by two Jewish organizations and that a great



part of it will be used for the relief of deserving members of that proud people. Their cruel and irrational treatment by the Nazis will in part be avenged.

I would like to bring out, also, that this bill provides that such property, the value of which is not to exceed \$3 million, is to be used for the relief of persecuted in need. Thus, it is not limited to members of the Jewish racial group. Knowing of similar work done under the United States Military Government in Germany, we may rest assured that this law will be administered carefully and fairly.

I heartily endorse the provisions of this bill and hope that it will soon become law.

#### REFERENCE OF COMMUNICATION TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Executive Communication 1783 from the Attorney General, transmitting the draft of a bill to provide rewards for information concerning illegal introduction into the United States or illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States of special nuclear material and weapons, be referred from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 9936

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday night to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire what will be the situation on Monday with reference to the bill S. 2420, upon which I made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that the vote will have to be taken all over again on Monday next.

#### AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my consent request for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7745) to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 12 of the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (5 U. S. C., sec. 118k (a), (b), and (c)), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. (a) No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall (1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or a nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any other such officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

"(b) (1) If any Federal agency charged with the duty of making any loan or grant of funds of the United States for use in any activity by any officer or employee to whom the provisions of subsection (a) are applicable has reason to believe that any such officer or employee has violated the provisions of such subsection, it shall make a report with respect thereto to the United States Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission'). Upon the receipt of any such report, or upon the receipt of any other information which seems to the Commission to warrant an investigation, the Commission shall fix a time and place for a hearing, and shall by registered mail send to the officer or employee charged with the violation and to the State or local agency employing such officer or employee a notice setting forth a summary of the alleged violation and the time and place of such hearing. At such hearing (which shall be not earlier than 10 days after the mailing of such notice) either the officer or employee of the State or local agency, or both, may appear with counsel and be heard. After such hearing, the Commission shall determine whether any violation of such subsection has occurred and whether such violation, if any, warrants the removal of the officer or employee by whom it was committed from his office or employment, and shall by registered mail notify such officer or employee and the appropriate State or local agency of such determination.

"(2) If the Commission finds that such officer or employee has not been removed from his office or employment on or before the date on which the Commission's determination becomes final, or that he has been so removed and has subsequently (within a period of 6 months) been appointed to any office or employment in any State or local agency in such State, the Commission shall make and certify to the appropriate Federal agency an order requiring it to withhold from its loans or grants to the State or local agency to which such notification was given an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate such officer or employee was receiving at the time of such violation; except that in any case of such a subsequent appointment to a position in another State or local agency which receives loans or grants from any Federal agency, such order shall require the withholding of such amount from such other State or local agency: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Commission require any amount to be with-

held from any loan or grant pledged by a State or local agency as security for its bonds or notes if the withholding of such amount would jeopardize the payment of the principal or interest on such bonds or notes. Notice of any such order shall be sent by registered mail to the State or local agency from which such amount is ordered to be withheld. The Federal agency to which such order is certified shall, after such order becomes final, withhold such amount in accordance with the terms of such order.

"(3) Any determination or order of the Commission shall become final upon the expiration of 30 days after the mailing of notice of such determination or order, except that if, in accordance with subsection (c), a determination or order is stayed, and thereafter such determination or order (whether or not modified) is affirmed, such determination or order shall become final upon such date subsequent to such affirmation as the Commission shall prescribe.

"(c) Any party aggrieved by any determination or order of the Commission under subsection (b) may, within 30 days after the mailing of notice of such determination or order, institute proceedings for the review thereof by filing a written petition in the district court of the United States for the district in which such officer or employee resides; but the commencement of such proceedings shall not operate as a stay of such determination or order unless it is specifically so ordered by the court. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served upon the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the determination or the order complained of was made. The review by the court shall be on the record entire, including all of the evidence taken on the hearing, and shall extend to questions of fact and questions of law. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence may materially affect the result of the proceedings and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, the court may direct such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings of fact or its determination or order by reason of the additional evidence so taken and shall file with the court such modified findings, determination, or order, and any such modified findings of fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The court shall affirm the Commission's determination or order, or its modified determination or order, if the court determines that the same is in accordance with law. If the court determines that any such determination or order, or modified determination or order, is not in accordance with law, the court shall remand the proceeding to the Commission with directions either to make such determination or order as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law or to take such further proceedings as, in the opinion of the court, the law requires. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals as in other cases, and the judgment and decree of such circuit court of appeals shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, secs. 346 and 347). If any provision of this subsection is held to be invalid as applied to any party with respect to any determination or order of the Commission, such determination or order shall thereupon become final and effective as to

such party in the same manner as if such provision had not been enacted."

SEC. 2. Subsection (e) of section 12 of such act of August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118k (e)), is hereby amended by striking out "the first two sentences" and inserting in lieu thereof "the first sentence."

SEC. 3. Section 18 of such act of August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118n), is hereby amended by striking out "or in the second sentence of section 12 (a) of this act."

SEC. 4. Determinations made or orders entered after February 1, 1954, by the Civil Service Commission in cases arising under section 12 of such act of August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118k), shall be governed by the provisions of such section as they are amended by this act.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] objected to the passage of this bill because of an understandable misunderstanding about the contents of H. R. 7745. I have discussed the measure with the gentleman and he agrees that the bill does do what he would have it do.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the consideration of this bill when it was presented earlier today. I did so because, after a cursory look at the bill, it appeared to me that it extended the Hatch Act to cover State employees. However, after having the bill explained to me by its sponsor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], I have found that it does exactly the opposite.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to withdraw my objections to the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CORBETT: Page 1, line 8, after the word "principal", insert the word "public."

Page 3, line 4, after the word "employee", strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

Page 3, line 17, strike out the words "of 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "set by the Civil Service Commission which shall not exceed 18 months."

Page 6, line 14, strike out "sections 239 and"; strike out all of line 15, and down to the period in line 16, and insert in lieu thereof "28 U. S. C. 1254."

Page 7, line 5, strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "August."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INTERIM AUTHORITY TO SPEAKER AND CLERK OF HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill (H. R. 7745) to amend certain provisions of the act of August 2, 1939, commonly known as the Hatch Act, relating to employees of State or local agencies whose activities are financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to give the Alabama delegation and any other friends in Congress here an opportunity to say a word about a great man and a good man, a wonderful soldier and statesman, just an all-around good and great American, LAURIE BATTLE, who is retiring from the Congress this session.

LAURIE BATTLE, as you know, did not run for his seat here in the House this year and he will retire to private life in Birmingham, one of the great cities not only of Alabama but of the earth.

You men here who have served so long with this wonderful and fine man will miss just as we of the Alabama delegation will miss him. But I imagine he will be coming back very often and some day he make take his seat again, who knows, because in that district they love this man who has served so well, who has worked so hard, who has done such an outstanding job not only for his district and for his State but for his Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I served with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He is author of the Battle Act for the control of the East-West trade. He has made magnificent contributions not only to the committee but to the policy of our whole Nation and I think the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. I wish him Godspeed and the best in the days ahead.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure also of serving for 2 years on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE]. I want to attest to his contribution to the very valuable work of that committee. His record of wise legislative accomplishments is a very fine one.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank our friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] to say a word about our beloved LAURIE BATTLE.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] for yielding to me. It is not so often that we stand on this floor to pay tribute to a young man, but this afternoon such is the case because LAURIE BATTLE is still a young man.

LAURIE BATTLE's service in this House is a matter of history. I want to say that he is a self-made man. LAURIE came up the hard way; that is, in part, he worked his way through college and by his grit, by his self-determination and by his desire to better himself in life, he attended several colleges, among them being the Birmingham-Southern College in his hometown of Birmingham, the Vanderbilt University, and Scarritt College, Ohio State University, and the University of Alabama.

LAURIE soon saw the need of national defense in this country and he attempted to do something about it. He offered his services to the Alabama National Guard and served an enlistment in the National Guard of the State of Alabama. Then in World War II he enlisted as a private and by that self-determination and by his desire to serve his country and his fellow man he served with distinction in the Pacific and in other areas during that awful conflict of World War II. When he was discharged, by his integrity and by his work he was discharged with the rank of major.

He entered the 80th Congress here in 1947 and applied himself to his committee work. He soon secured membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. We all know the work that he did on legislation which I think has meant much to this Nation and to the cause of democracy in the world. The legislation that he sponsored has become known in legislative history as the Battle Act. I am not going into the history of that act, but I do believe when a final history is written of this period a great deal of credit will be given to LAURIE BATTLE for his sponsorship of the resolution and bill through the House which provided that this Nation would not sit idly by and see nations that we were helping, nations that were supposed to help us in securing democracy in this world, trade with the enemy. So this House passed the bill which, in the final analysis, meant cutting off military, and financial aid, and economic aid to nations who violated the Battle Act.

I think a rather delightful thing concerning this Battle Act was due to the fact that the day this act was passed by the House, within 24 hours of that time, Mr. and Mrs. BATTLE had born to them a little Battle No. 3, and LAURIE, in making his remarks upon the floor at that time stated that it had been suggested to him that he name the baby H. R. 4550. Since that time there has been another child born to that happy union.

LAURIE, in closing these few remarks, I want to say to you that you leave the Halls of Congress here with the admiration and the love not only of your fellow



colleagues from the State of Alabama, but I am sure that I speak the sentiments of this whole body when I say to you and your lovely family that we wish for you in the years to come every happiness, health, and prosperity.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to confirm what the gentleman from Alabama has just said about our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE]. As chairman of the Oklahoma delegation, the Oklahoma delegation expresses its appreciation of the wonderful service the gentleman has rendered in a thorough, courteous, cooperative, and honest manner here in the House.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my few humble words extolling the virtues of our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE], who is retiring from active service in this House which he has graced and honored during the brief period that he has been here.

LAURIE BATTLE comes from my adjoining State, the good State of Alabama. I have watched his record during the time he served here in the House with ever increasing approval. LAURIE BATTLE is not a politician in the sense that we speak of politicians. If he were, he might not be leaving us; he might just be transferring over to another body. I like to think of LAURIE BATTLE here in this House of Representatives as a great patriot, a man who always approached the problems that arose here on this floor from the standpoint of how that particular problem and his attitude toward it was going to affect the Nation rather than how it was going to affect LAURIE BATTLE and his political future. I think that our friend, Laurie, has done a splendid job in this House. I wish we had more and more of his kind. Like Abou Ben Adhem, may his tribe increase.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I think I bespeak for the membership of this House generally on both sides of the aisle when I say that LAURIE BATTLE leaves us with the confidence, the respect, and the good wishes of all with whom he has served. You know, it is not so important how long you serve in this House but how well you perform while you are here. Measured by that yardstick, LAURIE BATTLE has done a good job.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the views expressed here in tribute to the gentleman from Alabama, LAURIE BATTLE. I personally have found it not only a great pleasure but a profitable experience to have had the opportunity to serve in the Congress of the United States with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE]. It may certainly be said of him that he is a scholar, a

statesman, and a gentleman. We are all going to miss him very much, and I regret personally that he has seen fit to terminate his service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin and also thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for the fine statement that he has made.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOYKIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with those who have spoken so favorably of my colleague, a member of my own committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I have had a real opportunity to know LAURIE BATTLE. While I cannot speak for the committee, I feel that I express the sentiments of the committee when I say that we are all going to miss him. I know of no individual member of that committee who has been more diligent in the tasks assigned to him. The Battle Act will stand as a monument to his work here.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the day will come when he will again be associated with us here or in some other body, because we need young men like LAURIE BATTLE in the service of our country.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank my colleague very much for that statement, and I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, LAURIE BATTLE and I came to Congress together in the 80th Congress.

I have watched LAURIE BATTLE through the years as we have served here together. I can truthfully say that I know of no Representative in this House who has served with a more sincere determination to represent the best interests of all of his people; who has served with greater courage or greater devotion to duty than has LAURIE BATTLE.

It was my pleasure to live as Laurie's neighbor in the same apartment development here in Washington for several years, and I came to know Laurie and his family very well. They were wonderful neighbors, and his family is one of which he may well be proud.

Not only is Laurie, in my opinion, one of the finest Representatives that we have had in this Congress since I have been here, but he is also one of the finest young men I have ever known in my life. He is a Christian gentleman. He is a man of sterling character, and he has earned and deserves the respect and admiration of the people of this country, the State of Alabama, and the State of Mississippi, which I have the pleasure to represent.

I wish him well as he leaves this body. I am glad to be able to say that I can count LAURIE BATTLE as one of my friends. I hope that our friendship will continue throughout the years, even though he may not be in Congress in those years. LAURIE BATTLE is a living example of what I would wish my son to be.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman for that fine statement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOYKIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a keen pleasure for me to have the opportunity to join with Alabama's great delegation in saluting one of its fine Members, LAURIE BATTLE. In the brief time I have been a Member of this Congress, I have come to like and to admire this fine southern gentleman. It has been a pleasure to associate with him in the baseball competition which has taken place between the two sides of the House for a very worthy cause in the District of Columbia. I have always found him, whether as a member of the Democratic baseball team or as a Member of the House, to be a great sportsman, a conscientious and able legislator, a truly fine gentleman, and, in the words of the gentleman from Mississippi, a great American. I know the House will miss him and I know that all of us wish him all success and all good fortune in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to join with other Members in paying tribute to our colleague, LAURIE BATTLE. I had the honor of serving with him as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He was a valued member of the committee during the 80th Congress when I was honored with being chairman of the committee.

I have respected LAURIE BATTLE for his industry, his ability, and his sincerity. His service and his contribution to the work of the committee were outstanding. He is a great American with a deep sense of justice. He is devoted to the best interests of his country and to his fellow men. Our kindest wishes are extended to LAURIE BATTLE and to his family.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have always especially liked the Members of the Alabama delegation. Several of them have served on our Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I have found them wonderfully fine and cooperative. Mr. BATTLE is a much respected friend and colleague and an able legislator. A real southern gentleman, he is everything that is splendid in Alabama and in the country. I am so sorry he and his family will leave Washington, and hope they will sometime return. I wish them great happiness and success.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. It has been my pleasure to know LAURIE BATTLE since he first came to Congress. Since I came to Congress I have known many Members but I can truthfully say I have never known a finer man in or out of Congress than LAURIE BATTLE. In my opinion he is one of the greatest legislators and public officials our State or

any other State has produced in many years.

LAURIE BATTLE possesses what I conceive to be the necessary qualifications and traits of character to be a good public official. First, he is ruggedly honest. Second, he has ability. Third, he has courage.

LAURIE BATTLE has done a magnificent job as Representative from the Ninth District of Alabama, which is possibly one of the most difficult congressional districts in America to represent. It has one of the biggest populations of any congressional district in America, and in that district you find groups whose interests are constantly in conflict.

LAURIE has voted his convictions from the day he got here. Many times the votes he cast here on certain bills were politically unwise. They were antagonistic to the interests of some of those groups in Jefferson County, Ala. But those people did not hold out on Laurie because of the votes he cast here. They had faith and confidence in him and in his sincerity. Year after year for four consecutive terms he came back to Congress with the biggest majority any Member of the House I have ever known has received in that congressional district that is so difficult to represent.

LAURIE has made a great contribution here to the legislation that was designed to better secure our Nation. The Battle Act has been a great help so far as the security of this Nation is concerned. It is one of the great pieces of legislation that has been passed since the end of World War II. Laurie has had the courage to vote his convictions. I have never known him to dodge a vote when he was in the city of Washington or any other time, and certainly not when he was here in Washington. He has had the courage to stand up and be counted on every issue. To say that we will miss him is very true. I hope that when he leaves here, as a Member of this House, he will have the same degree of success in whatever undertaking he applies himself to as he has enjoyed as a Member, and with him certainly will go our best wishes. I shall always treasure my friendship with LAURIE BATTLE because he is a sincere man, he is a true man, he is a dependable man and his friendship is based on sincerity which unfortunately in Washington is something that is very hard to find. Many times, we find here that friendship is based on convenience and necessity—but not so with LAURIE BATTLE. He is a true, loyal, patriotic American, and I wish for him in the future years of his life the best of everything.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you, Congressman ANDREWS. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in giving expression to the high regard and good wishes which I hold for LAURIE BATTLE as he returns to private life.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] has served in the Congress during a very difficult period of this country's history. It has been a period when we have been faced with the problem of making the adjustments following the

titanic struggle of World War II. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs he has played a most significant part in the formulation of our national policy, which has had for its objective the building of American allies on the one hand, and enunciating a position of firmness in our dealings with Russia, on the other. Over these years Russia's actions have made the conclusion inescapable that she will have it no other way than to be our enemy. A testimonial of LAURIE BATTLE's activity in the field of formulation of foreign policy is the Battle Act, the sponsorship of which gave him a national reputation.

As LAURIE BATTLE leaves the House of Representatives he has the satisfaction of knowing that he represented Alabama's largest city in such a manner that he was overwhelmingly reelected at the end of each 2-year term as long as he chose to seek the position.

The influence of his public service will live a long time. His accomplishments will continue to be a source of pride to his friends.

Again I want to express my very best wishes for the success and happiness of LAURIE BATTLE, his lovely wife Jan, and their children.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you kindly, Congressman ELLIOTT. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country. But that truism does not apply to a member of our delegation who is leaving the Halls of Congress—LAURIE BATTLE has honor in his own country and he has it because of the fact that people know he is a man who is sincere in purpose, a man who is fearless in action, a man who has the courage of his convictions. LAURIE BATTLE is still a young man—I say that because we are the same age—but I do not know of any man who in such a short time has attained more of the high honors in this land of ours than has our colleague and friend.

LAURIE has had excellent training and experience, and I think that he drew upon that experience and that background to make himself one of the outstanding legislators of this body. As a matter of fact, in his second term he offered a bill, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, H. R. 1516, which brought a great deal of stability to the Post Office Department, in that it provided for the reclassification of the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service. It established uniform procedure for computing compensation, and for other purposes. This became Public Law No. 257. Later, the act which bears his name, "The Battle Act," was passed. To my mind, and I think to the minds of most Members of this body, that act has had much to do with strengthening our defenses against the constantly growing threat of communism.

A great many good things have been said here today about LAURIE BATTLE, and it is difficult to add to the glowing tributes that have been paid to him. Not only has he been an outstanding legis-

lator, but he has been an outstanding patriot. Any man who enters the service as a private and in the short period of 3 years becomes a major, has an unusual amount of ability. He was overseas for about 16 months, and in that time he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal, the Philippine Liberation Medal, the Victory Medal, the American theater ribbon, the Asiatic-Pacific ribbon, and eight battle stars.

Since he has been in this body he has been cognizant of the needs of our veterans and has, on every occasion that I can recall, supported veterans' legislation that was beneficial.

LAURIE BATTLE will be missed in the Alabama delegation. He has always been cooperative. He not only represents his district but he has been willing to cooperate on anything that is for the betterment of our great State of Alabama. As he goes back to other pursuits, I hope that his efforts will be crowned with success. I know that he takes with him the love and devotion of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. SELDEN.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of Alabama's distinguished sons, LAURIE BATTLE. It has been a high privilege to have known and worked with Laurie as a Member of the House of Representatives, and it is with sincere regret that I see him leave this great legislative body.

I am proud of the fact that LAURIE BATTLE was born in Shelby County, Ala., 1 of the 8 counties of the district I now represent. He is the son of a Methodist minister, the late W. R. Battle, who was known and loved throughout the State of Alabama. Laurie received his education in Alabama's public schools, Birmingham Southern College, Vanderbilt University, Scarritt College, Ohio State University, and the University of Alabama. His record at all of these institutions was outstanding.

Entering as a private, he served in the Air Force during World War II and was discharged with the rank of major. Only a few months after his release from active duty, Laurie was elected to the 80th Congress from Alabama's Ninth Congressional District, at the age of only 34.

Upon election to the 80th Congress, LAURIE served first as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He was appointed to the Foreign Affairs Committee during the 81st Congress where he has served for the past 6 years. He has been an outstanding member of this great committee and is perhaps best known for the legislation that bears his name, the Battle Act.

LAURIE BATTLE's ability, his sound thinking, and his vision and foresight have earned him the respect and the admiration of the entire membership of this House. The people of his district, the State of Alabama, and the entire Nation can be grateful that we have had a man with the ability and the character of LAURIE BATTLE to serve as a Member of Congress during these crucial times. Certainly we are indebted to him for his



years of unselfish and devoted public service.

We regret to see you leave, Laurie, but upon your retirement from the House of Representatives, we wish for you, your lovely wife, Jan, and your three fine children the very best that life can bestow. We commend you for your past accomplishments, and we wish for you a future of success and happiness.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and further ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of LAURIE BATTLE.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I wish to pay tribute to our colleague, LAURIE BATTLE, who is retiring as Representative from the Ninth District of Alabama which he has served so loyally, devotedly, and energetically since the 80th Congress. He served as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress and was appointed to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 18, 1949, during the 81st Congress, and has served on that committee ever since.

During the 82d Congress, LAURIE BATTLE served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. Acutely conscious of his responsibilities and the importance of foreign economic policy in the foreign affairs of our Nation, he conducted a thorough study of the question of the trade of the free world with the Soviet bloc—East-West trade. As a result of this thorough and painstaking study, there emerged the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1949, which is known around the entire globe as the Battle Act, after the name of the distinguished author LAURIE BATTLE. The Battle Act has been successful in curtailing the shipment of strategic items by our allies to Iron Curtain countries. In June 1951, he served as chairman of the Economics Section of a Special Study Mission to Europe made up of members of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations Committees. Other members of this section included the Honorable Christian A. Herter, now Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, and the Honorable Frederic R. Coudert, Jr. He filed a report with the Foreign Affairs Committee just prior to its consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I know that much of the reorganization of the administration of our foreign aid program following the Mutual Security Act of 1951 resulted from the recommendations made by his group.

LAURIE BATTLE has always taken his responsibilities as a Member of Congress and as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee very seriously. To him public service is a great opportunity

and a high responsibility. This fundamental philosophy of LAURIE BATTLE's has been constantly demonstrated during his service as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. No matter how small the bill being considered by the committee, LAURIE BATTLE has always given it just as much careful attention as he has the larger and more important measures. He brought to the Foreign Affairs Committee a sense of sincerity, a public consciousness, and a willingness to spend many arduous hours in bringing forth the best possible legislation in the public interest, all of which qualities will be sorely missed.

I know that with his retirement there go the best wishes of his friends, his colleagues in the Congress, and his associates on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great loss to the House of Representatives that LAURIE BATTLE is retiring from Congress at the end of this term. As former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and now ranking minority member, I have served on that committee with LAURIE BATTLE for a number of years and have firsthand knowledge of his energy, integrity, ability, and devotion to duty. I know of no Member of Congress who has accomplished more during an equal tenure of years. He is the author of the famous Battle Act, which has done much in curbing trade with Russia and Iron Curtain countries. He was last year appointed by President Eisenhower as a member of the Foreign Economic Policy Commission, in which position he did yeoman work. Those are just two of his many achievements since he came here.

I must say, too, that I have a keen sense of personal loss in LAURIE BATTLE's retirement. I have come to know and love him and his fine family during the years they have been in Washington, and I am sure I speak for the entire membership of our committee and of the Congress itself when I say that it will be hard to fill his place and that we shall truly miss him.

I confidently believe that Laurie has a great future no matter what activity of life he decides to enter. I hope he will decide to come back here. But in any event, our thoughts and best wishes are with him and his family always.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] could not be here. He gave me a statement and asked me to read it. He says:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps no man has ever made warmer friends among his colleagues in Congress than has our friend LAURIE BATTLE. He is loved and respected by all of us, and we wish him, as he leaves us at the end of this session of Congress, every success in all his undertakings.

Laurie has made an excellent record representing the great Ninth District of Alabama. In his quiet, calm, and dignified way he has written a record here in the Congress which will be long remembered. Those of us in the Alabama delegation are going to miss him greatly.

That is the gentleman from Alabama ALBERT RAINS.

I am going to ask in a few minutes that LAURIE BATTLE take some of this time that I have, but before I do I do

just want to say that he could have stayed here as long as he wanted to. Although he might have been opposed he would have defeated the opposition by a tremendous majority, because the people in that great district love and respect him. His city of Birmingham is the greatest city in Alabama, maybe in the world, but certainly in the State of Alabama at this time now, for now they are bringing in iron ore from Venezuela and will have one of the largest steel developments there in the world, and that great river system—he has helped develop everything there. Since he has been the Congressman from that district it has practically doubled in size. So I say to you that LAURIE BATTLE could keep on coming back here.

These men here, the men in the Congress of the United States, your colleagues, who represent every human being in America, hate to see you go, but whatever your undertakings happen to be they will be delighted and glad to help and work with you because we know you would never want anything except the things that would be helpful to the people of this great Nation.

I have known LAURIE BATTLE ever since he came here. I have known his wonderful wife, Jan, and his fine children. I know his brother. I know his office force. He has one little girl there who is on the job all the time. I would like to mention her by name but the only name in the world I know her by is "Pat," but she sure stands pat for Laurie and his great district and she has done a fine job, and I do not think there has ever been a better secretary in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk forever about this young man who has done so much and is such a young fellow, and who will have so many opportunities. If he puts in the same amount of time, the same thought, the same work in his future undertakings that he has here he can go to any length that he wants.

The good Lord knows exactly what is best for all of us, and I know he knows what is best for LAURIE BATTLE. As one of our colleagues said, his father was a minister, and he said he was one of the greatest in the country. Well, I think that LAURIE BATTLE is one of the greatest Representatives, in my judgment, who has ever served in the Congress of the United States—and I have been here a long, long time.

I hate to see you go, and if you should ever want to come back I hope you will come. God bless you forever.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield the rest of my time to my great colleague [Mr. BATTLE], of Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, to say that I am grateful or overwhelmed would be an understatement. I believe the first speech I ever made on the floor of this House was about 6 o'clock one Sunday morning when we eulogized the departure of one of our friends. It is different when it happens to you.

I am most appreciative, Frank, to you as the dean of the Alabama delegation, to each and every Member of the Alabama delegation, and to my other friends in the House for this occasion today.

I have served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 8 years—at least by January 3, 1955, my 8 years will have been completed. Working day in and day out, year in and year out, so closely as we have, one gets to know his colleagues mighty well.

Mr. Speaker, I have developed a deep respect for the Members of the Alabama delegation and for those who are honoring me today, an appreciation of your ability, and a warm feeling of affection for you as persons and as friends. I have shared your joys and your sorrows, both legislatively and personally, along with your families and office staffs. As a delegation, we have always worked together in the interest of Alabama. As Members of Congress, we have always worked together for the security and well-being of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we have an able delegation from Alabama. They are always on the job, they are conscientious, and they have served our State well. I am leaving the job of representing the State of Alabama in good hands. We have had differences, of course—differences of opinion, differences of philosophy, and differences of interest—but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a natural process of free government. May we ever be free enough to express our differences of opinion and settle them in an orderly way. To paraphrase one of our earlier patriots, I would like to say that it has been, and will always be, my purpose to fight for the right to differ.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know, I believe—I certainly hope so—that I have done my best to serve my district, to serve our State, to cooperate with the Alabama delegation and I have done, above all, what I believed to be right, irrespective of the consequences.

In conclusion, I would like to say thank you from the bottom of my heart to each and every Member here today for their kind expressions and for the expressions of those who could not be here. I want to thank especially the older Members of the delegation and of the House for their help, and I also want to thank the newer Members for their cooperation, assistance, and friendship as well.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget this occasion. I will always be grateful to you, each and every one of you, who have spoken here today or expressed yourselves, and to all of my friends with whom I have served in the House of Representatives during the past 8 years. I will always be deeply grateful to my staff, and to my family. I will always be deeply grateful to the people of the Ninth District of Alabama for giving me the opportunity of serving in Congress, in the House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body in the world. May it ever be so.

Thank you very much.

#### FOREIGN AID IS NO BARGAIN FOR WISCONSIN TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin

[Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in matters relating to foreign policy, my friend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I have held opposite views. On July 28, in the Senate, he opened the debate on the mutual security bill of 1954—foreign aid. It was an able presentation in support of the full amount provided in the measure and generally expressed the views of those who have supported that legislation. I respect that point of view but differ almost wholly with it in view of present world conditions. I have asked for this time to answer in part the argument that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has made, namely, that the foreign-aid spending has been of great benefit to the people of the State of Wisconsin.

He says that Wisconsin agriculture in the past 5 years has exported \$175 million worth of farm products. Industry, he states, for that same period has exported about \$111 million of industrial or manufactured items, or a total of \$286 million of income for business and agriculture. So much for what we received in my State, and I do not minimize the amount my State has received and the work it has provided for Wisconsin people.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Senator did not mention what the foreign aid spending is costing the taxpayers of Wisconsin. This is a glaring omission, in my opinion, because it fails to give the people in my State the true picture, but only one side of it. I shall attempt to answer the important question as to what Wisconsin is paying for this program and submit some pertinent facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that foreign aid is no bargain for the taxpayers in my State, in spite of \$286 million of goods sold under it. The record is clear.

We have engaged in foreign-aid giving from July 1945, for 9 long years, and the total net aid provided in that period has been in excess of \$59 billion. For economic aid we have advanced more than \$38 billion, and for military assistance more than \$21 billion.

This program for the period that I have mentioned cost the taxpayers of my State \$1,223,680,000. Only 11 other States paid more than Wisconsin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has been the charge upon Wisconsin for the 5-year period mentioned in the Senator's speech? Keep in mind that the income, according to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], amounted to \$286 million.

However, the cost or charge upon the taxpayers of Wisconsin was actually \$504,370,400. It is my contention that the foreign-aid program has not helped the people in Wisconsin but actually they have paid almost twice as much to support the program than they have received. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that the program has been no bargain for Wisconsin taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the foreign-spending program justify their positions with the argument that our dollars will prevent the onward march of communism in Europe and Asia.

The record is abundantly clear that the expenditure of money is not stopping aggressive communism. Here is the record and it cannot be successfully refuted.

Before World War II, the world's only Communist country was the Soviet Union, containing 170 million people in 8.1 million square miles.

During World War II, Soviet Russia swallowed up Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, plus parts of Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, China, and Japan.

Just after World War II, Communists directed by Moscow took over all of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Soviet troops occupied East Germany and East Austria. Later, Yugoslavs broke with Moscow.

By 1950, Chinese Communists backed by Russia had conquered all of mainland China. In that year, Communists in North Korea attacked South Korea on Moscow's orders. Later, truce terms left North Korea in Communist hands. In 1951, Communist China conquered Tibet, on India's borders.

Now, in Indochina, Communists take over another 12 million people or more.

Net result: In 15 years, Communists have taken an additional 5.5 million square miles of territory and nearly 600 million people. The Communist empire today embraces 13.6 million square miles, one-fourth of the earth's land surface, and 800 million people, a third of the population of the earth.

In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, these facts are a complete refutation of the argument that American dollars have stopped communism militarily or politically.

#### IMPORTS OF CRUDE OIL IN THE UNITED STATES ARE RUINING OUR DOMESTIC MARKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to again call to the attention of the Congress the problem presented through excessive petroleum imports.

This problem is of concern to the Congress. It is of concern to the people of this country. It is not a partisan issue. The solution of it is basic to our economic well-being. It is essential to our national security.

It deserves the thoughtful attention of our national administration.

I have no desire to hamper the progress of the present administration. I want to be of help. I want to assist our administrative leaders as well as my colleagues on a subject important to our national welfare.

A few weeks ago, President Eisenhower pointed with pride to the comparative advantage the United States has over Russia in the production of oil. At the same time he suggested the influence for peace this advantage gave to the United States.

I do not want our country to lose that position. We are the one great power outside the Iron Curtain having within



its boundaries sufficient petroleum products to meet continued industrial expansion and for national security. Whether we remain in that position depends upon policies of our Government.

Whatever can be done to insure sound policies for national security and well-being should be the concern of all, whether in a legislative or administrative capacity.

I find no positive policy nor legislative or administrative program that now promises to preserve our position as to oil.

There is presently a world surplus of petroleum. Vast areas outside the United States have been opened for the production of oil, largely by American companies. This oil is valuable to the entire world and should be so developed and distributed.

We have learned in the United States that unwise development of our oil reserves results in great waste.

The impulse to find excessive markets causes waste of the producing reserves from which the oil is taken. Where this excessive production of oil is thrown onto markets, it can cause premature abandonment of older producing areas and an eventual loss of this valuable product.

Currently, oil produced from the new areas of production is from wells producing from one to six thousand barrels per day. The average per well production in the United States is less than 13 barrels per day. In my State of Kansas, our wells are producing on the average of nine barrels per well per day.

The conclusion is obvious: Unless some intervening program of restriction on the movement of this vast volume of oil now being produced at much less cost than the oil in the United States, our own ability to produce will be retarded.

When that is done, our country, and the friendly countries looking to us for petroleum supplies, will become dependent on areas outside of our own country for security.

Oil from the Middle East is becoming to an increasing extent, the source for the requirements of Europe and the entire Eastern Hemisphere. That market, once a valuable trade area for oil produced in the United States, is being lost to our producers.

Already the production in our States is being restricted. Kansas production has reached the minimum that can be imposed under our law.

Neighboring oil-producing areas have likewise been restricted. I understand that in Texas, our largest oil-producing State, production is now being restricted to a 15-day-per-month basis.

The market areas are now flooded, prices are being reduced and great concern is expressed throughout the industry.

Because the situation to which I am directing your attention is becoming more serious day by day, I invite the thinking of the Congress and the administration as well to give consideration to dealing with it before it becomes even worse.

Should other solutions fail, I will at an appropriate time again offer a pro-

positional for congressional solution. Last year I offered a bill to restrict these oil imports to 10 percent of our requirements.

Administrative leaders urged the Congress not to take such legislative action until a more complete study had been made. The Congress responded to this request and authorized a commission, suggested by the President, to study and report on this problem.

The Commission was appointed. If they studied the question of oil imports they failed to advise or recommend to the Congress what action we should take. If they advised the administration, that advice has not been acted on or passed on to Congress.

I think it is well known that the importance of this situation is recognized at the highest level in the administrative branches of Government.

On May 28, 1953, the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Douglas McKay, made a statement before the National Petroleum Council, in which he said he had discussed this question with the President and the National Security Council and that the statement made was concurred in by the President. That statement by the Secretary reads as follows:

For the past several weeks there has been considerable debate on those provisions of the Simpson bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which would limit imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil. The nature of the issues and the merits of the arguments are well known to all of you.

I testified before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in opposition to those provisions of the Simpson bill which would place statutory limitations on crude oil and residual fuel oil imports into this country. I testified in opposition to those provisions because I felt that their enactment into law would be more harmful to the overall economy of the country than the benefits to be derived.

So that you may understand more fully my position, I want to quote you the following sentences from my testimony:

"I recognize the importance of domestic petroleum production to national defense and the contribution it makes to the national economy and that of the oil-producing States. I also realize that the petroleum industry is unique in that discovery and development of new reserves constitute a major and vital activity of the industry. Oil and gas produced must be replaced by a vigorous and progressive search for new reserves or the Nation's ability to produce petroleum would rapidly deteriorate.

"I recognize how important it is that the strength of the domestic industry be maintained. To maintain this strength requires an economic climate that promotes the competition, progress, and technological development that has brought the industry to its present high degree of capability. The domestic industry today is undergoing a period of readjustment. The rate of growth in demand has leveled off after the rapid gains which followed the Korean outbreak. At the same time the expansion of supply has brought about a more normal reserve capacity. Demand is now dropping seasonally at the close of warm winter. Domestic production has been reduced in recent months, and there should be a corresponding cut in imports. There is evidence that already the industry is effecting such adjustments."

My belief that the industry, acting individually, will effect such adjustments in the level of imports is based upon faith that the individual interests of each importing company will lead to that desirable level of

imports necessary to preserve the health of the domestic industry and the security of this Nation more readily than can be achieved by resorting to undesirable and inflexible statutory restraints.

I am hopeful that those companies importing crude oil or products will show industrial statesmanship in this important matter and that each company, acting individually and wholly on its own individual judgment, will exercise that restraint in respect of imports necessary to the health and security of the Nation.

I have discussed this matter with President Eisenhower and the National Security Council. I can say to you that President Eisenhower concurs in these views.

For the 6 months immediately preceding the statement wherein Secretary McKay urged "a corresponding cut in imports," total petroleum imports amounted to 1,080,000 barrels per day. For a comparative 6 months ending May 1, 1954, imports have averaged 1,090,000 barrels a day.

Imports were not reduced, but domestic production was stagnated. Production of crude oil in the United States for the 6 months ending May 1, 1953, averaged 6,540,000 barrels per day; for the 6 months ending May 1, 1954, this production has been reduced to 6,375,000 barrels per day. This reduction was forced in the face of greatly increased producing capacity.

There should be a distinction in our national policy as between materials essential to our national defense and the less important commodities. For the first time, this distinction was recognized in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, when the Senate, without objection, adopted an amendment offered by Senator SYMINGTON, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. No action shall be taken pursuant to such section 350 to decrease the duty on any article the continued domestic production of which, in volume sufficient to meet projected national defense requirements, as determined by the President, would be threatened by such decrease in duty.

Here is not only recognition of the importance of essential materials, but, as well, a recognition of the fact that it is not a partisan issue. This amendment was offered by a Democrat and accepted without objection by the entire Senate.

On January 30, 1954, Honorable Felix Wormser, Assistant Secretary of Interior, in a speech before the Colorado Mining Association Convention at Denver, referring to a similar situation as to all minerals, stated:

In an effort to correct this situation, the President, as you know, has appointed a Minerals Policy Committee, consisting of four Cabinet members, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior. The other members are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, together with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget acting in an advisory capacity.

Efforts have been made in the past to formulate a minerals policy. The National Minerals Advisory Council of recent memory, endeavored to do the job, without success. It is perhaps the most difficult task the Government can perform in the minerals sphere. I know you will be interested to learn that a vast amount of groundwork has already been done by this committee. It should not be too long before results are crystallized to

such an extent that a report can be made to the President for his consideration. But I ask you not to be impatient in awaiting the completion of this important task.

The question of remedial action as to oil imports has long been before the Tariff Commission and other agencies of Government. On May 3, 1949, the Tariff Commission dismissed an application for "escape clause" relief made by the Independent Petroleum Association of America with the following statement, in part:

The present situation with respect to inventories, which has resulted in some current scaling down of both production and imports, thus appears to have been due almost wholly to factors other than past changes in the duty. The Commission will continue to observe closely further developments in the industry, and its action in dismissing the present application for an investigation does not prejudice in any way future consideration of the question of petroleum imports as related to the escape clause.

For the 6-month period prior to the signing of that order, petroleum imports into the United States amounted to 590,000 barrels per day; for 6 months ending May 1, 1954, imports amounted to 1,090,000 barrels per day. In other words, imports have practically doubled without further action by the Commission. Here we have assurance that the Tariff Commission is continuing to be alert as to this problem.

The continuing study by the Tariff Commission, the consideration that has been given by the Interior Department, and the awareness of the problem at the Cabinet level should provide a basis for such administrative action as may be necessary.

The problem continues. We have extended the trade agreements law for another year.

The Congress has deferred action, but it cannot afford to long postpone the time this problem must be met.

How long a condition that is recognized by all as being injurious to the welfare of our country can be permitted to continue without serious threat to the security of our country, I do not know. There is little chance of legislative action now during the closing days of this Congress. There is abundant time for such administrative corrections as are within their power.

In order to bring the problem I have just discussed down to date, I call attention to a recent article that appeared in the Journal of Commerce reciting the fact that one of the large oil companies has slashed crude buying in the State of Kansas to 70 percent. Here is what the article says. It appears in the Journal of Commerce for July 28, 1954:

#### SOHIO TO SLASH KANSAS CRUDE BUYING TO 70 PERCENT

Effective August 1, 1954, and continuing until further notice, Sohio Petroleum Co. will reduce its purchases from leases served by Kaw Pipe Line Co. in Kansas to 70 percent of actual purchases made in June of 1954.

In common with the industry, Sohio has substantially reduced refinery runs as compared to last year.

The leveling of United States demand, carryover from the winter season of unusually large products stocks—especially gaso-

line, loss of some Canadian markets, and the lack of effective regulation of crude-oil production in certain areas have resulted in excessive supplies of crude oil, the company stated.

Despite maximum effort to reduce purchases in other areas, including the institution of purchase prorationing, crude-storage facilities available to Sohio continue to fill and are approaching physical capacity limits. As a result, this further action has become necessary.

So it appears that while we continue to increase imports from foreign countries, we slash crude buying in the United States.

#### MRS. ELIZABETH PRUETT FARRINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama, who is leaving the Congress, I hope only for a short time.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman. I want to express my very deep appreciation for her kind words of a few moments ago and say that I regret leaving such a wonderful public servant as she is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my very great pleasure that the new delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable BETTY FARRINGTON, is a Delegate in this Congress of the United States. She is a friend of long standing. I have always loved her and admired her work for the Republican Party, her work for Hawaii, and her work for the country. She and our colleague the late Joe Farrington, worked hand in hand for the same principles and for the same causes. I have never seen a warmer welcome extended to any person in all of my experience in the Congress, and that has been some 30 years, than was extended to BETTY FARRINGTON yesterday when she was sworn in as Delegate. It was a tribute to her and her work as well as a tribute to Joe Farrington. I think it means that the Delegate, BETTY FARRINGTON, will be a great success in her work as Delegate in the House of Representatives and in every way of great value to Hawaii because of her knowledge of legislative procedure and governmental procedure, and her knowledge of the Territory of Hawaii and all its problems, and of great value to our country.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS, for today and the remainder of the session, on account of official business.

Mr. PRESTON, for today and the remainder of the session, on account of official business.

#### FOREIGN AID

Mr. VORYS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R.

9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) in two instances.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, the remarks he made earlier in the day and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole on the bill relating to trading with the enemy, and to include extraneous material.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2763. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 622. Resolution providing for additional funds for studies and investigations by the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 2623). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 629. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 22; with amendment (Rept. No. 2624). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 631. Resolution to provide expenses for the special committee authorized by House Resolution 439; without amendment (Rept. No. 2625). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 682. Resolution to provide necessary expenses for the Committee on Rules; without amendment



(Rept. No. 2626). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 218. Concurrent resolution favoring the waiver of State residence requirements in elections of Federal officials; with amendment (Rept. No. 2627). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TALLE: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report pursuant to section 5 (a) of Public Law 304 (79th Cong.) (Rept. No. 2628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 906. An act to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3379. An act to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act, so as to exempt from its application fabrics and wearing apparel which are not highly flammable; with amendment (Rept. No. 2630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TALLE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9648. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEARNS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1585. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1611. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3506. An act

to repeal the act approved September 25, 1914, and to amend the act approved June 12, 1934, both relating to alley dwellings in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3655. An act to provide that the Metropolitan Police force shall keep arrest books which are open to public inspection; without amendment (Rept. No. 2635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10158. A bill to provide for the payment of fees to counsel assigned to represent indigent defendants in felony cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 2636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9678. A bill to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2637). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 10186. A bill to provide that the Atomic Energy Commission shall make a study and investigation with respect to the use and development of atomic energy for peaceful pursuits; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 10187. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10188. A bill to authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 10189. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine-arts programs and projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 10190. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 699. Resolution to amend House Resolution 161; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Res. 700. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study of the procedures and practices under the Trading With the Enemy Act during the period from December 18, 1941, to the present; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Antonio Silva de Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 10192. A bill for the relief of Michele Constantino Pastore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1133. By Mr. FORRESTER: Petition of Mrs. Linda C. Ewing and sundry other citizens of Ashburn, Ga., calling for passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1134. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the board of aldermen, city of Somerville, Mass., favoring a hydroelectric plant for New England; to the Committee on Public Works.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### The Details of World Government

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years I have been trying to alert the people of the United States to the sinister clouds of desolation now forming to destroy this great Government. I have had to weave together bits of evidence coming to light here and there which in my judgment clearly spelled out the purposes of those citizens of the United States who desire and strive to substitute for our Government a world government by placing over it a world organization which would destroy our sovereignty and make this Government subservient to it.

The excuse which these misguided citizens make for this treasonable program is that it is being done in the name of peace. Peace would be the easiest thing in this world to accomplish if we were to surrender our means of protection and kneel down before the altar of peace and surrender our freedom and liberties. People behind the Iron Curtain have this kind of peace, but where is their freedom and liberty? I am just as much an advocate of peace as anyone can be, but the peace I want is not a slave's peace, but a peace with freedom and liberty. I do not want to be driven into slavery in the name of peace.

Just what is intended by the one-worlders is now definitely outlined. The people no longer have to go over the facts we have gathered here and there to prove this treasonable act, for now directly before us is the written plan with the specifications of this sinister world government.

The American Public Relations Forum, Inc., of Burbank, Calif., in its bulletin No. 31 of June 1954, outlines the whole scheme to destroy the sovereign power of the United States.

In 1955 it is planned to amend the Charter of the United Nations, with the design, it is said, "to produce a genuine, and, as we believe, a workable scheme of world government."

Membership: Membership should be open to all states, and all must be urged to join. Once membership has been accepted, continued membership must be compulsory. There must be no right of secession.

If the United States can be lured into this snare by these sirens of world government, we cannot get out except by revolution. Do the free citizens of the United States want any such contrivance merely because misguided peace advocates tell us this is what we want?

Disarmament: The charter will provide for the complete, simultaneous, universal, en-